arXiv:0805.2711v1 [math.AP] 18 May 2008

Multi-bump Solutions for a Strongly Indefinite Semilinear Schrödinger Equation Without Symmetry or convexity Assumptions

Shaowei Chen *

LMAM, School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University,
Beijing 100871, P. R. China
and
Department of Mathematics, Fujian Normal University,
Fuzhou 350007, P. R. China
E-mail: swchen6@yahoo.com.cn

Abstract: In this paper, we study the following semilinear Schrödinger equation with periodic coefficient:

$$-\triangle u+V(x)u=f(x,u),\ u\in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

The functional corresponding to this equation possesses strongly indefinite structure. The nonlinear term $f(x,t)$ satisfies some superlinear growth conditions and need not be odd or increasing strictly in t. Using a new variational reduction method and a generalized Morse theory, we proved that this equation has infinitely many geometrically different solutions. Furthermore, if the solutions of this equation under some energy level are isolated, then we can show that this equation has infinitely many $m-$bump solutions for any positive integer $m\geq 2$.

Key words: semilinear Schrödinger equation, multi-bump solutions, critical group, reduction methods.
2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35J20, 35J70

1 Introduction and main results

In this paper, we consider the following problem

$$-\triangle u+V(x)u=f(x,u),\ u\in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N),\tag{1.1}$$

where $x=(x_1,x_2,\cdots,x_N)\in\mathbb{R}^N$ $(N\geq 1)$ and V, f satisfy the following conditions:

$(\mathbf{V_1})$. $V\in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is $1-$periodic in each $x_i,\ i=1,\cdots,N$.

$(\mathbf{V_2})$. The linear operator $L:H^2(\mathbb{R}^N)\to L^2(\mathbb{R}^N),\ u\mapsto -\triangle u+Vu$ is invertible and 0 lies in a gap of the spectrum of L.

$(\mathbf{f_1})$. $f(x,t)$ is a Caratheodory function and is $1-$periodic in each $x_i,\ i=1,\cdots,N$. $f'_t(x,t)$ exists for every $t\in\mathbb{R}$ and for almost all $x\in\mathbb{R}^N$. And $f'_t(x,t)$ is a Caratheodory function.

$(\mathbf{f_2})$. For some $2<q<p<2^*:=\begin{cases}\frac{2N}{N-2}, & N\geq 3\\ \infty, & N=1,2\end{cases}$ and $C>0$,

$$|f'_t(x,t)|\leq C(|t|^{q-2}+|t|^{p-2}),\ \text{for any } (x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}.$$

---

*The author acknowledges the support of NNSF of China (No. 10526041).

$(\mathbf{f_3})$. There exists $\gamma > 2$ such that for every $t \neq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$0 < \gamma F(x,t) \leq t f(x,t),$$

where $F(x,t) = \int_0^t f(x,s)ds$.

Note that the power nonlinearity $f(x,t) = h(x)|u|^{p-2}u$, with positive $1-$periodic $h \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $h(x) \geq 0,\ h \not\equiv 0$ and $2 < p < 2^*$, satisfies all the assumptions.

Under the assumptions $(\mathbf{V_1}) - (\mathbf{V_2})$ and $(\mathbf{f_1}) - (\mathbf{f_3})$ the functional

$$J(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|\nabla u|^2 + V(x)u^2)dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} F(x,u)dx \tag{1.2}$$

is of class C^2 on the Sobolev space $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and critical points of (1.2) correspond to weak solutions of Equation (1.1).

The operator $L = -\triangle + V$ (on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$) has purely continuous spectrum which is bounded below and consists of closed disjoint intervals ([16, Theorem XIII.100]). We denote by $|L|^{1/2}$ the square root of the absolute value of L. The domain of $|L|^{1/2}$ is the space $X := H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. On X, we choose the inner product $(u,v)_X = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |L|^{1/2}u \cdot |L|^{1/2}v dx$ and the corresponding norm $||u|| = \sqrt{(u,u)_X}$. There exists an orthogonal decomposition $X = Y \oplus Z$ such that Z and Y are the positive and negative spaces corresponding to the spectral decomposing of L. They are invariant under the action of $\mathbb{Z}^N$, i.e., for any $u \in Y$ or $u \in Z$ and for any $\mathbf{k} = (n_1, \cdots, n_N) \in \mathbb{Z}^N$, $u(\cdot - \mathbf{k})$ is also in Y or Z. Furthermore,

$$\forall u \in Y,\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|\nabla u|^2 + Vu^2)dx = -(u,u)_X = -||u||^2, \tag{1.3}$$

$$\forall u \in Z,\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|\nabla u|^2 + Vu^2)dx = (u,u)_X = ||u||^2. \tag{1.4}$$

Since 0 lies in a gap of spectrum of L, the dimensions of Y and Z are both infinity. In this case, Equation (1.1) is called strongly indefinite. By (1.3) and (1.4), we have

$$J(u) = \frac{1}{2}||Qu||^2 - \frac{1}{2}||Pu||^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} F(x,u)dx,\ u \in X. \tag{1.5}$$

It is easy to verify that if v is a solution of Equation (1.1), then $v(\cdot - \mathbf{k})$ is also a solution of Equation (1.1) for any $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^N$. Let u and v be two solutions of Equation (1.1). They are called geometrically different if $u(\cdot - \mathbf{k}) \neq v$ for any $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^N$. Let $v_1, \cdots, v_n$ be solutions of Equation (1.1) such that their barycenter are sufficiently separated. Solutions of Equation (1.1) that are close to $\sum_{i=1}^m v_i$ are called $m-$bump solutions. The main result of this paper is the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume* $(\mathbf{V_1}) - (\mathbf{V_2})$ *and* $(\mathbf{f_1}) - (\mathbf{f_3})$. *Equation (*1.1*) has infinitely many, geometrically different solutions. Furthermore, if the condition* **(*)** *(see Section 2 for its definition) holds, then for any positive integer* $m \geq 2$, *Equation* (1.1) *has infinitely many, geometrically different,* $m-$*bump solutions.*

Equation (1.1) arises from studying of steady state and standing wave solutions of time-independent nonlinear Schrödinger equations. Readers can consult [13] for more physical background and applications of Equation (1.1). Semilinear Schrödinger equation with periodic potential has been studied by many authors in the past decade. In the celebrate papers [7] and [8], Coti Zelati and Rabinowitz used a variational gluing methods to obtain multi-bump type solutions for Hamilton ODE and elliptic PDEs with periodic potential. The linear parts of the Hamilton ODE and elliptic PDEs they studied are positive definite and the functionals corresponding to these Hamilton ODE and elliptic PDEs have Mountain Pass structures. Coti Zelati and Rabinowitz used the solutions obtained by Mountain Pass theorem as basic building blocks to construct multi-bump solutions. Readers can consult [2], [11], [12] and references therein for more recent development in this direction. In [17], Séré considered some Hamiltonian systems whose linear parts are strongly indefinite, i.e., the dimensions of the positive and negative spaces corresponding to the spectral decomposing are both infinity. He constructed multi-bump solutions for these Hamiltonian systems. But he imposed some convexity conditions on the nonlinear terms of these Hamiltonian systems and then transform them by dual variational methods into some equivalent systems whose variational functionals are bounded below. For the strong indefinite semilinear Schrödinger equation (1.1), Alama and Li constructed multi-bump solutions in [3] by dual variational methods under the assumption that $f(x,t)$ increases strictly in t, i.e., the function $F(x,t)$ is convex. The first work of directly dealing with Equation (1.1) without the convexity assumptions on nonlinear term f was done by C. Troestler and M. Willem in [18]. They obtained the results on the existence of nontrivial solutions to Equation (1.1). In [10], Kryszewski and Szulkin obtained the result that there exist infinitely many geometrically different solutions to Equation (1.1) whenever f is odd in u. In a very recent paper [1], Ackermann provided an interesting abstract framework in which multi-bump solutions can be obtained in many situations. It reduces the problem of constructing multi-bump solutions to the problem of finding an isolated solution with nontrivial topology in a specific sense. Using the abstract results in [1], a very general result on the existence of multi-bump solutions to strong indefinite periodic semilinear Schrödinger equations (even with nonlocal nonlinearities) is obtained. However in [1], the result on the existence of multi-bump solutions for Equation (1.1) was obtained under the assumptions that the nonlinear term $f(x,t)$ is C^2 and convex in t. Therefore, the question on the existence of infinitely many geometrically different solutions for Equation (1.1) without the assumption that f is odd in t or $F(x,t)$ is convex in t was still left open.

Theorem 1.1 of the present paper gives an affirmative answer to this open problem. In the present paper we shall show that Equation (1.1) has a solution $u_0 \neq 0$ which has the properties that after reducing the corresponding functional of Equation (1.1) in a neighborhood of u_0, the critical group of the reduction function in the critical point u_0 is nontrivial. Then using u_0 as a basic building block, we constructed multi-bump solutions for Equation (1.1) by a perturbation technique stemed from Chang and Ghoussoub (see [6]). To obtain such u_0, we consider the approximation problem firstly:

$$-\triangle u + V(x)u = f(x,u),\ u \in H^1_{per}(Q_k), \tag{1.6}$$

where Q_k is cube of $\mathbb{R}^N$ with edge length $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $H^1_{per}(Q_k)$ denotes the space of $H^1(Q_k)-$functions which are $k-$periodic in $x_i,\ i = 1,2,\cdots,N$. The variational functional corresponding to (1.6) satisfies Palais-Smale condition and has linking structure (see [14]). Secondly, using the linking theorem (one can see [19] for reference), we can get a solution u_k of (1.6) which satisfies that there exist finite many nontrivial solutions $u^i,\ i = 1,\cdots,n$ of Equation (1.1) and sequences $\{b^i_k\},\ i = 1,2,\cdots,n$ such that $|b^i_k - b^j_k| \to \infty,\ i \neq j$ as $k \to \infty$ and

$$||u_k - \sum_{i=1}^{n} u^i(\cdot - b^i_k)||_{H^1(Q_k)} \to 0.$$

Finally, we show that at least one of $u^i,\ i = 1,\cdots,n$ has the properties that its critical group of the reduction function is nontrivial.

This paper is organized as follows: From Section 2 to Section 4, we use an approximation method, reduction methods and critical point theory to obtain the existence of a special nontrivial solution of Equation of (1.1) which has the properties we mentioned above. In Section 5, we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. In Section 6, we provide the detail proofs of some Lemmas stated in Section 3.

Notation. $\mathbb{R},\ \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{N}$ denote the sets of real number, integer and positive integer respectively. $B_E(a,\rho)$ denotes the open ball in E centered at a and having radius ρ. The closure of a set A is denoted by $\overline{A}$ or $cl(A)$. By $\to$ we denote the strong and by $\rightharpoonup$ the weak convergence. $\text{dist}(a,A)$ denotes the distance from the point a to the set A. $\text{diam}(A)$ denotes the diameter of the set A. By $\ker A$ denotes the null space of the operator A. If f is a C^2 functional defined on a Hilbert space H, ∇f (or df) and $\nabla^2 f$ denote the gradient of f and the second differential of f respectively. And for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote $f^a := \{u \in H\ :\ f(u) \leq a\}$ and $f_b := \{u \in H\ :\ f(u) \geq b\}$ the sub- and superlevel sets of the functional f, moreover, $f^a_b := \{u \in H\ :\ b \leq f(u) \leq a\}$. $\delta_{i,j}$ denotes the Kronecker notation: $\delta_{i,j} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1, i = j \\ 0, i \neq j. \end{array} \right.$ If H is a Hilbert space and W is a closed subspace of H, we denote the orthogonal complement space of W in H by $W^{\perp}$. For a subset $A \subset H$, span$\{A\}$ denotes the subspace of H generated by A.

2 A periodic approximation problem

Associated with Equation (1.1), we study the approximation problem in cubes Q_k of $\mathbb{R}^N$ with edge length $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$-\triangle u + V(x)u = f(x,u) \text{ in } Q_k,\ u \in E_k := H^1_{per}(Q_k), \tag{2.1}$$

where $H^1_{per}(Q_k)$ denotes the space of $H^1(Q_k)-$functions which are $k-$periodic in x_i, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$. The operator $-\triangle + V$ on $L^2_{per}(Q_k)$ has discrete spectrum with eigenvalues $\lambda_{k,1} \le \lambda_{k,2} \le \cdots \to +\infty$ and there exists a finite $\min\{i : \lambda_{k,i} > 0\}$. Moreover, every eigenvalue $\lambda_{k,i}$ is contained in the spectrum of $-\triangle + V$ on the whole space. This follows from the spectral gap around 0 assumed in Reed and Simon (see [16]). Therefore, if $(-\alpha, \beta),\ \alpha, \beta > 0$ denotes the spectral gap around 0 assumed in $(\mathbf{V_2})$. We claim that $\lambda_{k,i} \notin (-\alpha, \beta)$ for every $k, i \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote by $\phi_{k,i}$ the corresponding eigenfunctions.

Let $j(k) = \min\{i : \lambda_{k,i} > 0\} - 1$. Now we define an orthogonal decomposition of E_k by $E_k = Y_k \oplus Z_k$, where

$$Y_k = \text{span}\{\phi_{k,1}, \cdots, \phi_{k,j(k)}\},\ Z_k = Y_k^{\perp}.$$

The associated energy functional to (2.1) is

$$J_k(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{Q_k} (|\nabla u|^2 + V(x)u^2)dx - \int_{Q_k} F(x,u)dx. \tag{2.2}$$

We may define a new inner product $(\cdot,\cdot)_k$ on E_k with corresponding norm $||\cdot||_k$ such that

$$\forall u \in Y_k,\ \int_{Q_k} (|\nabla u|^2 + Vu^2)dx = -(u,u)_k = -||u||_k^2, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\forall u \in Z_k,\ \int_{Q_k} (|\nabla u|^2 + Vu^2)dx = (u,u)_k = ||u||_k^2. \tag{2.4}$$

If we denote by $P_k : E_k \to Y_k$ and $T_k : E_k \to Z_k$ the orthogonal projections, our functional becomes

$$J_k(u) = \frac{1}{2}(||T_k u||_k^2 - ||P_k u||_k^2) - \int_{Q_k} F(x,u)dx. \tag{2.5}$$

For convenience, we assume that $Q_k = (-\frac{k}{2}, \frac{k}{2})^N,\ k \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & H^1_{per}(Q_k) \\ = \ & \{u \in H^1(Q_k) : u(x_1, \cdots, x_{i-1}, -\frac{k}{2}, x_{i+1}, \cdots, x_N) = u(x_1, \cdots, x_{i-1}, \frac{k}{2}, x_{i+1}, \cdots, x_N), \\ & (x_1, \cdots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \cdots, x_N) \in (-\frac{k}{2}, \frac{k}{2})^{N-1},\ i = 1, \cdots, N\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbb{Z}_k = \mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$. For $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_k^N$ and $u \in E_k$, the action of $\mathbf{b}$ on u, we still denote it by $u(\cdot + \mathbf{b})$, is defined by the following way: For $\mathbf{b} = (0, \cdots, 0, \overset{i}{1}, 0 \cdots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}_k^N$ and $u \in E_k$,

$$u(x + \mathbf{b}) = \begin{cases} u(x_1, \cdots, x_{i-1}, x_i + 1, x_{i+1}, \cdots, x_N), & -\frac{k}{2} \le x_i \le \frac{k}{2} - 1 \\ u(x_1, \cdots, x_{i-1}, x_i + 1 - k, x_{i+1}, \cdots, x_N), & \frac{k}{2} - 1 \le x_i \le \frac{k}{2}, \end{cases}$$

$$u(x - \mathbf{b}) = \begin{cases} u(x_1, \cdots, x_{i-1}, x_i - 1, x_{i+1}, \cdots, x_N), & -\frac{k}{2} + 1 \le x_i \le \frac{k}{2} \\ u(x_1, \cdots, x_{i-1}, x_i - 1 + k, x_{i+1}, \cdots, x_N), & -\frac{k}{2} \le x_i \le -\frac{k}{2} + 1. \end{cases}$$

Since $V(x)$ and $f(x,t)$ is $1-$periodic in $x_k,\ k = 1, \cdots, N$, we deduce that J_k is invariant under the action of $\mathbb{Z}_k^N$.

Lemma 2.1. *([14, Lemma 2]) There exist constants $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ which are independent of k such that for any $u \in E_k$,*

$$C_1 ||u||_{H^1(Q_k)} \leq ||u||_k \leq C_2 ||u||_{H^1(Q_k)}.$$

By the conditions $(\mathbf{f_1}) - (\mathbf{f_3})$, we have the following Lemma (one can see [15] for reference):

Lemma 2.2. *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, J_k satisfies (PS) conditions.*

Lemma 2.3. *([13, Lemma 3.3] or [14, Lemma 4]) There exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ not depending on k such that $||u_k||_k \geq \epsilon_1,\ ||u|| \geq \epsilon_1$ holds for any nontrivial critical point u_k of J_k and u of J. In addition, there exists $\epsilon_2 > 0$ not depending on k such that $J_k(u_k) \geq \epsilon_2,\ J(u) \geq \epsilon_2$ holds for any nontrivial critical point u_k of J_k and u of J.*

Lemma 2.4. *([14, Lemma 8]) There exist real number $\delta > 0$ and $r > 0$ which are independent of k such that $\inf\limits_{u \in N_k} J_k(u) \geq \delta$, where $N_k = \{z \in Z_k : ||z||_k = r\}$.*

Now for each k, we fix a function $z_k \in Z_k$ with $||z_k||_k = 1$. For $\rho > 0$, we define the sets

$$M_k = \{y + tz_k : ||y + tz_k||_k \leq \rho,\ t \geq 0,\ y \in Y_k\}.$$

Lemma 2.5. *([14, Lemma 9]) There exists a $\rho > r$ which is independent of k such that*

$$\sup_{u \in \partial M_k} J_k(u) = 0.$$

Lemma 2.6. *([13, Theorem 3.4] or [14, Lemma 10]) The number*

$$c_k = \inf_{h \in \Gamma_k} \sup_{u \in M_k} J(h(u))$$

is a critical value of J_k and there exists positive number M which is independent of k such that $0 < \delta \leq c_k \leq M < \infty$, where

$$\Gamma_k = \{h \in C(E_k, E_k) : h|_{\partial M_k} = id\}.$$

Let χ_k be cut-off functions such that $0 \leq \chi_k \leq 1,\ \chi_k \equiv 1$ on $Q_{k-1},\ \chi_k \equiv 0$ outside of Q_k and $|\nabla \chi_k| \leq C,\ k = 1, 2, \cdots$.

Lemma 2.7. *([13, Theorem 5.1] or [14, Theorem 11]) Under the assumptions $(\mathbf{f_1}) - (\mathbf{f_3})$. Let $v_k \in E_k$ be a uniformly bounded sequence which satisfies $J'_k(v_k) \to 0$ and $\widetilde{c}_k = J_k(v_k) \to \widetilde{c} > 0$. Then there exist critical points v^i, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, \nu$ of J and sequences $d_k^i \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ such that as $k \to \infty$, $|d_k^i - d_k^j| \to \infty,\ i \neq j$,*

$$||v_k - \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} v^i(\cdot + d_k^i)||_k \to 0$$

and $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{\nu} J(v^i) = \widetilde{c}$.

Let K and K_k be the sets of critical points of J and $J_k,\ k = 1, 2, \cdots$ respectively. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, let $K^a := K \cap J^a,\ K_a := K \cap J_a$, $K_a^b := K \cap J^a \cap J_b$ and $K_k^a = J_k^a \cap K_k$.

Let

$$c_0 = \sup_k c_k, \tag{2.6}$$

where c_k is the minimax value defined in Lemma 2.6. Now we impose the following condition on Equation (1.1):

(*). There exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that $K^{c_0 + \alpha_0}/\mathbb{Z}^N$ is finite.

Lemma 2.8. *If the condition* **(*)** *holds, then the following three statements hold:*

(1). There exists $\beta_0 \in (0, \alpha_0)$ such that

$$\inf\{||\nabla J(u)|| : u \in X,\ J(u) = c_0 + \beta_0\} > 0 \tag{2.7}$$

and there exists constant $\epsilon_3 > 0$ not depending on k such that

$$\inf\{||\nabla J_k(u)||_k : u \in E_k,\ J_k(u) = c_0 + \beta_0\} > \epsilon_3 \tag{2.8}$$

if k large enough.

(2). There exist $\delta_0 > 0$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $k \geq k_0$, then for any $u_k \in K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}$,

$$B_{E_k}(u_k, \delta_0) \cap K_k^{c_0+\beta_0} = B_{E_k}(u_k, \delta_0/2) \cap K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}.$$

It follows that when $k \geq k_0$, for any $u_k^1, u_k^2 \in K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}$, either $||u_k^1 - u_k^2||_k \leq \delta_0/2$ or $||u_k^1 - u_k^2||_k \geq \delta_0$.

(3). For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $k_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $k \geq k_\epsilon$, then for any $u_k \in K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}$,

$$B_{E_k}(u_k, \delta_0) \cap K_k^{c_0+\beta_0} = B_{E_k}(u_k, \epsilon) \cap K_k^{c_0+\beta_0},$$

where δ_0 is the constant appeared in (2). It follows that when $k \geq k_\epsilon$, for any $u_k^1, u_k^2 \in K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}$, either $||u_k^1 - u_k^2||_k \leq \epsilon$ or $||u_k^1 - u_k^2||_k \geq \delta_0$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, we know that there exists $\epsilon_2 > 0$ such that for any $u \in K$, $J(u) \geq \epsilon_2$. Let $\bar{l} = [\frac{\alpha_0 + c_0}{\epsilon_2}] + 1$ and let

$$\mathcal{F}_{\bar{l}}(K^{c_0+\alpha_0}) := \{\sum_{i=1}^{j} v_i(\cdot - b_i) : 1 \leq i \leq j,\ \ 1 \leq j \leq \bar{l},\ v_i \in K^{c_0+\alpha_0},\ b_i \in \mathbb{Z}^N\}.$$

If $c \in (c_0, c_0 + \alpha_0)$ satisfies that there exists a sequence $\{u_m\}$ such that as $m \to \infty$,

$$J(v_m) \to c,\ ||\nabla J(v_m)|| \to 0, \tag{2.9}$$

then by Proposition 1.24 of [7], we deduce that there exist at most $\bar{l}$ nontrivial solutions $v_i \in K^{c_0+\alpha_0},\ i = 1, \cdots, \bar{l}$ and $\bar{l}$ sequence $\{d_m^i\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^N$ such that as $m \to \infty$, $|d_m^i - d_m^j| \to \infty,\ i \neq j$, $c = \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{l}} J(v^i)$ and

$$||u_m - \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{l}} v^i(\cdot - d_m^i)|| \to 0. \tag{2.10}$$

By the condition **(*)**, we know that

$$\mathcal{A} = \{\sum_{i=1}^{j} J(u_i)\ :\ 1 \leq i \leq j,\ 1 \leq j \leq \bar{l},\ u_i \in K^{c_0+\alpha_0}\}$$

is a finite set. It follows that the possible $c \in (c_0, c_0 + \alpha_0)$ which satisfies (2.9) is finite. If we choose $\beta_0 \in (0, \alpha_0)$ such that $c_0 + \beta_0 \in (c_0, c_0 + \alpha_0) \setminus \mathcal{A}$, then (2.7) holds.

We are ready to prove that (2.8) holds. If not, then there exists a sequence $\{u_k\}$ such that $u_k \in E_k,\ J_k(u_k) = c_0 + \beta_0,\ k = 1, 2, \cdots$ and $||\nabla J_k(u_k)||_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Then by Lemma 2.7 we deduce that there exist at most $\bar{l}$ nontrivial solutions $v_i \in K^{c_0+\alpha_0},\ i = 1, \cdots, \bar{l}$ and $\bar{l}$ sequence $\{d_m^i\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^N$ such that as $m \to \infty$, $|d_m^i - d_m^j| \to \infty,\ i \neq j$, $c_0 + \beta_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{l}} J_k(v^i)$ and

$$||u_m - \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{l}} v^i(\cdot - d_m^i)||_k \to 0.$$

It follows that $c_0+\beta_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. It is a contradiction. Thus (2.8) holds.

By the condition **(*)** and Proposition 1.55 of [7], we know that

$$\mu=\mu(\mathcal{F}_{\bar{l}}(K^{c_0+\alpha_0})):=\inf\{||x-y|| \ : \ x\neq y\in \mathcal{F}_{\bar{l}}(K^{c_0+\alpha_0})\}>0. \tag{2.11}$$

Choose $\delta_0=\mu/2$. If there exist two sequences $\{u_k^1\}$ and $\{u_k^2\}$ such that $u_k^i\in K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}, \ k=1,2,\cdots, \ i=1,2$ and $\frac{\delta_0}{2}<||u_k^1-u_k^2||<\delta_0$, then by Lemma 2.7, we deduce that there exist $v_k^1, v_k^2\in \mathcal{F}_{\bar{l}}(K^{c_0+\alpha_0})$ such that as $k\to\infty$

$$||u_k^i-v_k^i||_k\to 0, \ i=1,2.$$

It follows that $||v_k^1-v_k^2||\leq \delta_0<\mu$ when k large enough. It contradicts the definition of μ. Thus the result of (2) holds.

The proof of result (3) is similar. □

Remark 2.9. *In fact, by Lemma* 2.7*, we get that as* $k\to\infty$*,*

$$dist(K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}, \mathcal{F}_{\bar{l}}(K^{c_0+\alpha_0}))\to 0.$$

*By (*2.11*), we know that* $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{l}}(K^{c_0+\alpha_0})$ *is a discrete set. Thus* $K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}$ *can be decomposed into a union of its subsets which are disjoint each other.*

By Lemma 2.8, we have the following Lemma

Lemma 2.10. *Suppose that the condition* **(*)** *holds. There exist positive integer* $m_k>0$ *and* m_k *subsets* $K_k^{(i)}, \ i=1,2\cdots,m_k$ *of* $K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}$ *such that if* $k\geq k_0$*, then*

$$K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}=\bigcup_{i=1}^{m_k}K_k^{(i)},$$

dist$(K_k^{(i)},K_k^{(j)})\geq \delta_0, \ i\neq j$ *and diam*$(K_k^{(i)})\leq \delta_0/2, \ i=1,2\cdots,m_k$*, where* δ_0*,* k_0 *and* β_0 *are the constants appeared in Lemma* 2.8*. Furthermore, for any* $1\leq i\leq m_k$*, as* $k\to\infty$*,*

$$diam(K_k^{(i)})\to 0.$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.8, we know that if $k\geq k_0$, then $K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}$ can be decomposed into a union of its subsets $K_k^{(i)}$ which are disjoint each other. We show that the number of these subsets is finite. If not, by Lemma 2.8 there exist $K_k^{(i)}, \ i=1,2,\cdots$ such that $K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}=\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty}K_k^{(i)}$ and dist$(K_k^{(i)},k_k^{(j)})\geq\delta_0, \ i\neq j$. Choose $u_{i,k}\in K_k^{(i)}$. Then $u_{i,k}$ satisfies that

$$||u_{i,k}-u_{j,k}||\geq \delta_0, \ i\neq j. \tag{2.12}$$

By Lemma 2.2, we get that there exists a subsequence $\{u_{i_m,k}\}$ of $\{u_{i,k}\}$ and $u\in E_k$ such that $||u_{i_m,k}-u||_k\to 0$ as $m\to\infty$. It contradicts (2.12). Therefore, the number of $K_k^{(i)}$ is finite. We denote it by m_k. Finally, by the result (3) of Lemma 2.8, we get that diam$(K_k^{(i)})\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$. □

Let $H_*(A,B)$ be the $*-$th singular homology group with coefficient $\mathbb{Z}_2$. By the definition of $c_k=\inf_{h\in\Gamma_k}\max_{u\in M_k}J_k(h(u))$, the Linking Theorem (one can see [15] or [19] for reference) and the proof of Theorem 7.5 of [4], we have the following Lemma:

Lemma 2.11. *Let* $\widehat{\delta}=\min\{\delta/2,\epsilon_2\}$ *where* δ *and* ϵ_2 *are the constants appeared in Lemma* 2.4 *and Lemma* 2.3 *respectively, then*

$$H_{j(k)+1}(J_k^{c_0+\beta_0}, J_k^{\widehat{\delta}})\neq 0. \tag{2.13}$$

By Lemma 2.8 we know that $K_k^{(i)},\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, m_k$ are isolated critical sets of J_k. In [6], Chang and Ghoussoub provided a definition of critical group for isolated critical set. In [9] and [5], the authors defined the Gromoll-Meyer pair (for short GM-pair) for an isolated critical point for C^1-functional. And in [6], Chang and Ghoussoub extended the definition of GM-pair into a dynamically isolated critical set (see Definition I.10 of [6]).

Let f be a C^1 functional on a Finsler manifold M (Banach space is a special case of Finsler manifold) with critical set K_f. And let V be a pesudo-gradient vector field V with respct to df on M. A pesudo-gradient flow associated with V is the unique solution of the following ordinary differential equation in M :

$$\dot{\eta} = V_1(\eta(x,t)),\ \eta(x,0) = x,$$

where $V_1(x) = g(x)\frac{V(x)}{||V(x)||}$ and $g(x) = \min\{\text{dist}(x, K_f), 1\}$. A subset W of M is said to have the mean value property (for short (MVP)) if for any $x \in M$ and any $t_0 < t_1$ we have $\eta(x, [t_0, t_1]) \subset W$ whenever $\eta(x, t_i) \in W,\ i = 1, 2$.

Definition 2.12. *(Definition I.10 of [6]) Let f be a C^1 functional on a Finsler manifold M. A subset S of the critical set K of f is said to be a dynamically isolated critical set if there exist a closed neighborhood $\mathcal{O}$ of S and regular values $a < b$ of f such that*

$$\mathcal{O} \subset f^{-1}[a, b] \tag{2.14}$$

and

$$cl(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) \cap K \cap f^{-1}[a, b] = S, \tag{2.15}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} = \bigcup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \eta(\mathcal{O}, t)$. $(\mathcal{O}, a, b)$ is called an isolating triplet for S.

After providing the definition of dynamically isolated critical set, the authors of [6] give the definition of critical group for dynamically isolated critical set as follows:

Definition 2.13. *Let S be a dynamically isolated critical set of a C^1 functional f and let $(\mathcal{O}, a, b)$ be any isolating triplet for S. For each integer q, we shall call the qth homology goup*

$$C_q(f, S) = H_q(f^b \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^+, f^a \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^+)$$

the qth critical group for S, where $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^+ = \bigcup_{t\geq 0} \eta(\mathcal{O}, t)$.

Remark 2.14. *In [6], the critical group is defined by the cohomology group of the topology pair $(f^b \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^+, f^a \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^+)$. Here we use the homology group instead. All results in [6] still holds for homology group since the properties of cohomology the authors used in [6] are excision property and homotopy property.*

Definition 2.15. *(Definition III.1 of [6]) Let f be a C^1 functional on a Finsler manifold M and let S be a subset of the critical set K_f for f. A pair (W, W_-) of subset is said to be a GM-pair for S associated with a pesudo-gradient vector field V, if the following conditions hold:*

(1). W is a closed (MVP) neighborhood of S satisfying $W \cap K = S$ and $W \cap f_\alpha = \emptyset$ for some α.

(2). W_- is an exit set for W, i.e., for each $x_0 \in W$ and $t_1 > 0$ such that $\eta(x_0, t_1) \notin W$, there exists $t_0 \in [0, t_1)$ such that $\eta(x_0, [0, t_0]) \subset W$ and $\eta(x_0, t_0) \in W_-$.

(3). W_- is closed and is a union of a finite number of sub-manifolds that transversal to the flow η.

In [6], the authors proved the following theorem which can be seen as another definition of the critical group for a dynamically isolated critical set.

Lemma 2.16. *(Theorem III.3 of [6]) Let f be a C^1 functional on a C^1 Finsler manifold M and let S be a dynamically isolated critical set for f. Then for any GM-pair (W, W_-) for S, we have*

$$H_*(W, W_-) \cong H_*(f^b \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^+, f^a \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}^+) = C_*(f, S),$$

where $(\mathcal{O}, a, b)$ is an isolating triplet for S.

By [6] and Lemma 2.10, we have the following Lemma

Lemma 2.17. *There exists an index* i_k *satisfying* $1 \le i_k \le m_k$ *such that*

$$C_{j(k)+1}(J_k, K_k^{(i_k)}) \ne 0,\ k = 1, 2, \cdots. \tag{2.16}$$

Proof. It is easy to verify that $((J_k)_{\widehat{\delta}}^{c_0+\beta_0}, c_0 + \beta_0, \widehat{\delta})$ is an isolating triplet for the isolated critical set $K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}$, where $\widehat{\delta}$ is the constant appeared in Lemma 2.11 and

$$(J_k)_{\widehat{\delta}}^{c_0+\beta_0} = \{u \in E_k\ :\ \widehat{\delta} \le J_k(u) \le c_0 + \beta_0\}.$$

Thus by the Definition 2.13 and Lemma 2.11, we have

$$C_{j(k)+1}(J_k, K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}) = H_{j(k)+1}(J_k^{c_0+\beta_0}, J_k^{\widehat{\delta}}) \ne 0. \tag{2.17}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{C} = \{\sum_{i=1}^{j} J(v_i) \mid 1 \le i \le j,\ 1 \le j \le \bar{l},\ v_i \in K^{c_0+\beta_0}\} \cap (-\infty, c_0 + \beta_0].$$

By the condition $(*)$ we know that $\mathcal{C}$ is a finite set. Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, \cdots, c_{n_0}\}.$$

and $c_1 < c_2 < \cdots < c_{n_0}$. Thus by Lemma 2.7, we get that

$$\mathrm{dist}_{\mathbb{R}}(J_k(K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}), \mathcal{C}) \to 0,\ k \to \infty. \tag{2.18}$$

Choose $\epsilon_0 = \frac{1}{2}\min\{c_i - c_{i-1} \mid i = 2, \cdots, n_0\}$. For $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, let $K_k^{(i,j)} = K_k^{(i)} \cap (J_k)_{c_j-\epsilon}^{c_j+\epsilon}$, $j = 1, \cdots, d_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, m_k$. By Lemma 2.8 and Remark 2.9, we know that if k large enough, $K_k^{(i,j)}$ does not dependent on ϵ.

By Proposition 2.2 of [7], we get that for any $0 < \delta < \mu$ (for the definition of μ see (2.11) in the proof of Lemma 2.8), there exists constant $\varsigma_\delta > 0$ such that

$$\inf\{||\nabla J(u)|| \mid u \in J^{c_0+\alpha_0} \setminus N_\delta(\mathcal{F}_{\bar{l}}(K^{c_0+\alpha_0}))\} > 0. \tag{2.19}$$

Then by Lemma 2.7, we get that there exists constant $\varsigma_\delta > 0$ which is independent of k, such that

$$\inf\{||\nabla J_k(u)|| \mid u \in J_k^{c_0+\alpha_0} \setminus N_\delta(K_k^{c_0+\alpha_0})\} > \varsigma_\delta > 0. \tag{2.20}$$

By Lemma 2.8, we get that $\mathrm{diam}(K_k^{(i)}) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ and $\mathrm{dist}(K_k^{(i)}, K_k^{(j)}) \ge \delta_0,\ i \ne j$, when k large enough. Thus by (2.18), (2.20), Section 2 of [9] or page 49 and page 50 of [5], we know that we can choose $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ and $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ such that there exist GM-pair $(W_{i,j}, W_{i,j}^-)$ of $K_k^{(i,j)}$ such that

$$W_i \subset \{u \in E_k\ :\ \mathrm{dist}(u, K_k^{(i)}) \le \delta/4\},\ j = 1, \cdots, d_i,\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, m_k.$$

Thus $(\bigcup_{i=1}^{m_k} W_i, \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_k} W_i^-)$ is a GM-pair of $K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}$. By (2.17) and Lemma 2.16, we get that

$$H_{j(k)+1}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{m_k} W_i, \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_k} W_i^-) \cong C_{j(k)+1}(J_k, K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}) = H_{j(k)+1}(J_k^{c_0+\beta_0}, J_k^{\widehat{\delta}}) \ne 0. \tag{2.21}$$

Since W_i and W_j are disjoint if $i \ne j$, we get that

$$H_{j(k)+1}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{m_k} W_i, \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_k} W_i^-) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_k} H_{j(k)+1}(W_i, W_i^-). \tag{2.22}$$

By Lemma 2.16, we have

$$H_{j(k)+1}(W_i, W_i^-) \cong C_{j(k)+1}(J_k, K_k^{(i)}). \tag{2.23}$$

By $(2.17) - (2.23)$, we get that

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_k} C_{j(k)+1}(J_k, K_k^{(i)}) \cong C_{j(k)+1}(J_k, K_k^{c_0+\beta_0}) \neq 0. \tag{2.24}$$

Thus there exists an index i_k satisfying $1 \leq i_k \leq m_k$ such that $C_{j(k)+1}(J_k, K_k^{(i_k)}) \neq 0$. □

3 A reduction method

Let $K_k^{(i_k)}$ satisfy (2.16) and $u_k \in K_k^{(i_k)},\ k = 1, 2 \cdots$. By Lemma 2.7, we know that there exist a positive integer n, n functions $u^i \in K^{c_0+\beta_0},\ i = 1, \cdots, n$ and n sequences $\{b_k^i\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^N,\ i = 1, \cdots, n$ such that as $k \to \infty$,

$$|b_k^i - b_k^j| \to +\infty,\ \text{for any } i \neq j \text{ and } ||u_k - \sum_{i=1}^n u^i(\cdot + b_k^i)||_{H^1(Q_k)} \to 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $|b_k^i| \to +\infty$ as $k \to \infty,\ i = 1, \cdots, n$.

The proofs of the following four Lemmas shall be provided in the appendix. For convenience, we denote $f_t'(x,t)$ by $f'(x,t)$.

Lemma 3.1. *The following limit holds uniformly for any* $\psi_k, \varphi_k \in E_k$ *which satisfy* $||\psi_k||_k \leq 1,\ ||\varphi_k||_k \leq 1$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{Q_k} |f'(x, u_k) - f'(x, \sum_{i=1}^n u^i(\cdot + b_k^i))| \cdot |\psi_k| \cdot |\varphi_k| dx = 0.$$

Lemma 3.2. *If* $\{\widetilde{v}_k\}$ *and* $\{v_k\}$ *are two bounded sequences in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ *which satisfy that* $||\widetilde{v}_k - v_k|| \to 0$ *as* $k \to \infty$*, then the following two results holds:*

(1). The Limit

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |f(x, \widetilde{v}_k) - f(x, v_k)| \cdot |\varphi| \to 0,\ k \to \infty$$

holds uniformly for $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ *which satisfies* $||\varphi|| \leq 1$.

(2). The Limit

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |f'(x, \widetilde{v}_k) - f'(x, v_k)| \cdot |\varphi \cdot \psi| \to 0,\ k \to \infty$$

holds uniformly for $\varphi, \psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ *which satisfy* $||\varphi|| \leq 1$, $||\psi|| \leq 1$.

Lemma 3.3. *As* $k \to \infty$*, the limit*

$$\int_{Q_k} |f'(x, \sum_{i=1}^n u^i(\cdot + b_k^i)) - \sum_{i=1}^n f'(x, u^i(\cdot + b_k^i))| \cdot |\varphi_k \cdot \psi_k| dx \to 0$$

holds uniformly for any $\psi_k, \varphi_k \in E_k$ *which satisfy that* $||\varphi_k||_k \leq 1,\ ||\psi_k||_k \leq 1$.

Lemma 3.4. *(1). Suppose* $v_k^i \in E_k,\ a_k^i \in \mathbb{Z}^N,\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ *which satisfy that for any* $i \neq j$, $|a_k^i - a_k^j| \to \infty$ *as* $k \to \infty$*. Then as* $k \to \infty$*, the limit*

$$\int_{Q_k} |f'(x, \sum_{i=1}^n v_k^i(\cdot + a_k^i) - \sum_{i=1}^n f'(x, v_k^i(\cdot + a_k^i)))| \cdot |\varphi_k \cdot \psi_k| dx \to 0$$

holds uniformly for any $\psi_k, \varphi_k \in E_k$ *which satisfy* $||\varphi_k||_k \leq 1,\ ||\psi_k||_k \leq 1$.

(2). Suppose $v^i \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $a_k^i \in \mathbb{Z}^N,\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ which satisfy that for any $i \neq j$, $|a_k^i - a_k^j| \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. Then as $k \to \infty$, the limit

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |f'(x, \sum_{i=1}^{n} v^i(\cdot + a_k^i) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} f'(x, v^i(\cdot + a_k^i)))| \cdot |\varphi \cdot \psi| dx \to 0$$

holds uniformly for any $\psi,\ \varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ which satisfy $||\varphi|| \leq 1,\ ||\psi|| \leq 1$.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that $v_k \in \ker \nabla^2 J_k(u_k)$ and $||v_k||_k = 1,\ k = 1, 2, \cdots$. Then there exist $v^i \in \ker \nabla^2 J(u^i),\ i = 1, \cdots, n$ such that as $k \to \infty$,*

$$||v_k - \sum_{i=1}^{n} v^i(\cdot + b_k^i)||_{H^1(Q_k)} \to 0.$$

Proof. Since $v_k \in \ker \nabla^2 J_k(u_k)$, we have

$$-\triangle v_k + V(x) v_k = f'(x, u_k) v_k, \text{ in } E_k. \tag{3.2}$$

By Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.3, we know that the limit

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{Q_k} |f'(x, u_k) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} f'(x, u^i(\cdot + b_k^i))| \cdot |\varphi_k| \cdot |\psi_k| dx = 0$$

holds uniformly for $\varphi_k, \phi_k \in E_k$ which satisfy $||\varphi_k||_k \leq 1,\ ||\psi_k||_k \leq 1$. Assume that $v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \rightharpoonup v^i$ in $H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as $k \to \infty$. By $||v_k||_k = 1$, we deduce that $v^i \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

By

$$-\triangle v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) + V(x) v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) = f'(x, u_k(\cdot - b_k^i)) v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \text{ in } E_k,$$

$u_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \rightharpoonup u^i$ and $v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \rightharpoonup v^i$ in $H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, we get that

$$-\triangle v^i + V(x) v^i = f'(x, u^i) v^i \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^N), \tag{3.3}$$

i.e. $v^i \in \ker \nabla^2 J(u^i),\ i = 1, \cdots, n$.

Recall that χ_k be cut-off functions satisfying that $0 \leq \chi_k \leq 1,\ \chi_k \equiv 1$ on $Q_{k-1},\ \chi_k \equiv 0$ outside of Q_k and $|\nabla \chi_k| \leq C$. Set $v_k^i = \chi_k v^i$, we have $v_k^i \in E_k$. If $\varphi \in E_k$, then by (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{Q_k} \nabla v_k^i \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{Q_k} V(x) v_k^i \varphi \\
= \ & \int_{Q_k} \nabla v^i \cdot \nabla(\chi_k \varphi) + \int_{Q_k} V(x) v^i \cdot (\chi_k \varphi) - \int_{Q_k} \varphi \nabla v^i \nabla \chi_k + \int_{Q_k} v^i \nabla \chi_k \nabla \varphi \\
= \ & \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u^i) \cdot v^i \cdot (\chi_k \varphi) - \int_{Q_k} \varphi \nabla v^i \nabla \chi_k + \int_{Q_k} v^i \nabla \chi_k \nabla \varphi \\
= \ & \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u^i) \cdot (\chi_k v^i) \cdot \varphi - \int_{Q_k} \varphi \nabla v^i \nabla \chi_k + \int_{Q_k} v^i \nabla \chi_k \nabla \varphi \\
= \ & \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u^i) \cdot v_k^i \cdot \varphi - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \backslash Q_k} \varphi \nabla v^i \nabla \chi_k + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \backslash Q_k} v^i \nabla \chi_k \nabla \varphi.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that for any $\varphi \in E_k$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{Q_k} \nabla v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i) \nabla \varphi + \int_{Q_k} V(x) v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i) \varphi \\
= \ & \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u^i(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i) \cdot \varphi - \int_{Q_k} (\nabla v^i(\cdot + b_k^i) \cdot \nabla \chi_k(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot \varphi \\
& + \int_{Q_k} v^i(\cdot + b_k^i) \nabla \chi_k(\cdot + b_k^i) \cdot \nabla \varphi.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

By (3.4), we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{Q_k} \nabla v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i)\nabla\varphi + \int_{Q_k} V(x)v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i)\varphi \\
= \;& \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u^i(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot v_k \cdot \varphi \\
& + \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u^i(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i) \cdot \varphi - \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u^i(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot v_k \cdot \varphi \\
& + \int_{Q_k} v^i(\cdot + b_k^i)\nabla\chi_k(\cdot + b_k^i) \cdot \nabla\varphi - \int_{Q_k} (\nabla v^i(\cdot + b_k^i) \cdot \nabla\chi_k(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot \varphi.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

By (3.2) and (3.5), we get that for any $\varphi \in E_k$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{Q_k} \nabla(v_k - \sum_{i=1}^n v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot \nabla\varphi + \int_{Q_k} V(x) \cdot (v_k - \sum_{i=1}^n v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot \varphi \\
= \;& \int_{Q_k} (f'(x, u_k) - \sum_{i=1}^n f'(x, u^i(\cdot + b_k^i))) \cdot v_k \cdot \varphi \\
& - \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u^i(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot (v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i) - v_k) \cdot \varphi \\
& - \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{Q_k} v^i(\cdot + b_k^i)\nabla\chi_k(\cdot + b_k^i) \cdot \nabla\varphi + \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{Q_k} (\nabla v^i(\cdot + b_k^i) \cdot \nabla\chi_k(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot \varphi.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Since $v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \rightharpoonup v^i$ in $H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as $k \to \infty$, we get that the limit

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u^i(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot (v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i) - v_k) \cdot \varphi = 0 \tag{3.7}$$

holds uniformly for $\varphi \in E_k$ which satisfies $||\varphi||_k \leq 1$. By Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.3, we know that that the following limit holds uniformly for $\varphi \in E_k$ which satisfies $||\varphi||_k \leq 1$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{Q_k} (f'(x, u_k) - \sum_{i=1}^n f'(x, u^i(\cdot + b_k^i))) \cdot v_k \cdot \varphi = 0. \tag{3.8}$$

Furthermore, the following limits hold uniformly for $\varphi \in E_k$ which satisfies $||\varphi||_k \leq 1$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{Q_k} v^i(\cdot + b_k^i)\nabla\chi_k(\cdot + b_k^i) \cdot \nabla\varphi = \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus Q_k} v^i(\cdot + b_k^i)\nabla\chi_k(\cdot + b_k^i) \cdot \nabla\varphi = 0, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{Q_k} (\nabla v^i(\cdot + b_k^i) \cdot \nabla\chi_k(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot \varphi = \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus Q_k} (\nabla v^i(\cdot + b_k^i) \cdot \nabla\chi_k(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot \varphi = 0. \tag{3.10}$$

By $(3.6) - (3.10)$, we deduce that the following equality holds uniformly for $\varphi \in E_k$ which satisfies $||\varphi||_k \leq 1$,

$$\int_{Q_k} \nabla(v_k - \sum_{i=1}^n v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot \nabla\varphi + \int_{Q_k} V(x) \cdot (v_k - \sum_{i=1}^n v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i)) \cdot \varphi = o(1), \text{ as } k \to \infty. \tag{3.11}$$

Recall that $P_k : E_k \to Y_k$ and $T_k : E_k \to Z_k$ are the orthogonal projections. Choose $\varphi = T_k(v_k - \sum_{i=1}^n v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i))$ and $\varphi = P_k(v_k - \sum_{i=1}^n v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i))$ respectively in (3.11), we get that as $k \to \infty$,

$$||T_k(v_k - \sum_{i=1}^n v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i))||_k \to 0,\ ||P_k(v_k - \sum_{i=1}^n v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i))||_k \to 0.$$

Therefore, as $k \to \infty$, $||v_k - \sum_{i=1}^n v_k^i(\cdot + b_k^i)||_k \to 0$. □

The following notations will be used in this and the next Sections.

- Let $N_i = \ker \nabla^2 J(u^i) = \text{span}\{e_{i,1}, \cdots, e_{i,l_i}\}$, where $l_i = \dim N_i,\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ and $(e_{i,s}, e_{i,j})_X = \delta_{s,j}$.
- Let $N_i^k = \text{span}\{(\chi_k e_{i,1})(\cdot+b_k^i), \cdots, (\chi_k e_{i,l_i})(\cdot+b_k^i)\} \subset E_k,\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, n, \Lambda_k = \text{span}\{\bigcup_{i=1}^n N_i^k\} \subset E_k$ and $\Pi_k = \Lambda_k^\perp$, the orthogonal complement space of Λ_k in E_k.
- Let $\widetilde{N}_i^k = \text{span}\{e_{i,1}(\cdot + b_k^i), \cdots, e_{i,l_i}(\cdot + b_k^i)\},\ i = 1, \cdots, n,\ \widetilde{\Lambda}_k = \text{span}\{\bigcup_{i=1}^n \widetilde{N}_i^k\} \subset X$ and $\widetilde{\Pi}_k = (\widetilde{\Lambda}_k)^\perp$, the orthogonal complement space of $\widetilde{\Lambda}_k$ in X.
- Let $\widehat{N}_i^k = \text{span}\{\chi_k e_{i,1}, \cdots, \chi_k e_{i,l_i}\} \subset E_k$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$.
- For convenience, denote $(\chi_k u^i)(\cdot + b_k^i),\ \chi_k u^i,\ (\chi_k e_{i,j})(\cdot + b_k^i)$ and $e_{i,j}(\cdot + b_k^i)$ by $u_k^i,\ \widehat{u}_k^i,\ e_{i,j}^k$ and $\widetilde{e}_{i,j}^k$ respectively, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, l_i,\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$.

Lemma 3.6. *There exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N},\ \delta_0 > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ which are independent of k such that*

(1). if $k \geq k_0$, then for any $u \in B_{E_k}(u_k, \delta_0)$, the operator

$$\widetilde{T}_k \circ \nabla^2 J_k(u)|_{\Pi_k} : \Pi_k \to \Pi_k$$

is invertible and

$$||(\widetilde{T}_k \circ \nabla^2 J_k(u)|_{\Pi_k})^{-1}|| \leq \eta,\ k = 1, 2, \cdots,$$

where $\widetilde{T}_k : E_k \to \Pi_k$ is the orthogonal projection.

(2). if $k \geq k_0$, then for any $u \in B_{E_k}(\widehat{u}_k^i, \delta_0)$, the operator

$$P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp} \circ \nabla^2 J_k(u)|_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp} : (\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp \to (\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp$$

is invertible and

$$||(P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp} \circ \nabla^2 J_k(u)|_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp})^{-1}|| \leq \eta,\ k = 1, 2, \cdots,$$

where $P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp} : E_k \to (\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp$ is the orthogonal projection.

Proof. We only give the proof of the result (1), since the proof of the result (2) is similar. If the result (1) is not true, then there exists a sequence $\{\widetilde{u}_k\}$ such that $\widetilde{u}_k \in E_k$ and as $k \to \infty$,

$$||u_k - \widetilde{u}_k||_k \to 0,\ ||\widetilde{T}_k \circ \nabla^2 J_k(\widetilde{u}_k)|_{\Pi_k}|| \to 0. \tag{3.12}$$

By (3.12), we know that there exists $v_k \in \Pi_k$ satisfying $||v_k||_k = 1$ and as $k \to \infty$,

$$||\widetilde{T}_k(\nabla^2 J_k(\widetilde{u}_k)v_k)||_k \to 0. \tag{3.13}$$

Step 1. We shall prove that if $v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \rightharpoonup v^i$ in $H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, then $v^i \in \ker \nabla^2 J(u^i),\ i = 1, \cdots, n$.

Choose $\varphi \in (\ker \nabla^2 J(u^i))^{\perp}$. Let $\varphi_k = \chi_k \varphi$. Then $\varphi_k \in E_k$. Assume that

$$\varphi_k(\cdot + b_k^i) = \widetilde{\varphi}_k + \widehat{\varphi}_k,$$

where $\widetilde{\varphi}_k \in \Pi_k$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_k \in \Lambda_k$. Since $\lim_{k\to\infty} |b_k^i| = +\infty$, we deduce that for any $u \in \ker \nabla^2 J(u^i)$, as $k \to \infty$, the limit

$$(\varphi_k(\cdot + b_k^i), \chi_k u)_k \to 0.$$

It follows that $||\widehat{\varphi}_k||_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Thus as $k \to \infty$,

$$||\widetilde{\varphi}_k(\cdot - b_k^i) - \varphi_k||_{H^1(Q_k)} \to 0.$$

By (3.13), we get that as $k \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\nabla^2 J_k(\widetilde{u}_k) v_k, \widetilde{\varphi}_k)_k \\ = \ & \int_{Q_k} \nabla v_k \cdot \nabla \widetilde{\varphi}_k + \int_{Q_k} V(x) v_k \cdot \widetilde{\varphi}_k - \int_{Q_k} f'(x, \widetilde{u}_k) \cdot v_k \cdot \widetilde{\varphi}_k \to 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Note that $v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \rightharpoonup v^i$ in $H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\widetilde{u}_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \rightharpoonup u^i$ in $H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\widetilde{\varphi}_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \to \varphi$ in $H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, by (3.14) and

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{Q_k} f'(x, \widetilde{u}_k(\cdot - b_k^i)) \cdot v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \cdot \widetilde{\varphi}_k(\cdot - b_k^i) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f'(x, u^i) \cdot v^i \cdot \varphi,$$

we get that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \nabla v^i \cdot \nabla \varphi + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x) v^i \cdot \varphi - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f'(x, u^i) v^i \cdot \varphi = 0. \tag{3.15}$$

Since φ is an arbitrary function in $(\ker \nabla^2 J(u^i))^{\perp}$, by (3.15), we have $v^i \in \ker \nabla^2 J(u^i)$.

Step 2. We shall prove that $v^i = 0,\ i = 1, \cdots, n$.

By the result of **Step 1** and the definition of Λ_k, we know that $\chi_k v^i(\cdot + b_k^i) \in \Lambda_k$. Since $v_k \in \Pi_k$, we get that $(v_k, \chi_k v^i(\cdot + b_k^i))_k = 0$, i.e., $(v_k(\cdot - b_k^i), \chi_k v^i)_k = 0$, $k = 1, 2 \cdots$. By $v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \rightharpoonup v^i$ in $H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $\chi_k v^i \to v^i$ in $H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, we get that as $k \to \infty$,

$$(v_k(\cdot - b_k^i), \chi_k v^i)_k \to ||v^i||^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}.$$

Thus $v^i = 0,\ i = 1, \cdots, n$.

Step 3. We shall prove that as $k \to \infty$, $||\nabla^2 J_k(\widetilde{u}_k) v_k||_k \to 0$.

Since $||\widetilde{T}_k(\nabla^2 J_k(\widetilde{u}_k) v_k)||_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, by the definition of $\widetilde{T}_k$, to prove this claim we only need to prove that for any $u \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} N_i^k$, as $k \to \infty$,

$$(\nabla^2 J_k(\widetilde{u}_k) v_k, u)_k \to 0.$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $u = \chi_k \varphi(\cdot + b_k^i)$, where $\varphi \in N_i$ for some i. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & (\nabla^2 J_k(\widetilde{u}_k) v_k, \chi_k \varphi(\cdot + b_k^i))_k \\ = \ & \int_{Q_k} \nabla v_k \nabla(\chi_k \varphi(\cdot + b_k^i)) + \int_{Q_k} V(x) v_k \cdot \chi_k \varphi(\cdot + b_k^i) - \int_{Q_k} f'(x, \widetilde{u}_k) v_k \cdot \chi_k \varphi(\cdot + b_k^i) \\ = \ & \int_{Q_k} \nabla(v_k(\cdot - b_k^i)) \cdot \nabla(\chi_k \varphi) + \int_{Q_k} V(x) v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \cdot \chi_k \varphi \\ & - \int_{Q_k} f'(x, \widetilde{u}_k(\cdot - b_k^i)) \cdot v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \cdot \chi_k \varphi. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \rightharpoonup 0 \text{ in } H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N), \text{ (by } \mathbf{Step2})$$
$$\chi_k\varphi \to \varphi \text{ in } H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N),$$
$$\widetilde{u}_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \rightharpoonup u^i \text{ in } H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N), \text{ (by (3.12) and (3.1))}$$

by (3.15), we get that as $k \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k\to\infty} (\nabla^2 J_k(\widetilde{u}_k)v_k, \chi_k\varphi(\cdot + b_k^i))_k \\ = & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \nabla v^i \cdot \nabla\varphi + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x)v^i \cdot \varphi - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f'(x,u^i)v^i \cdot \varphi = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the result of this step.

Step 4. We are ready to prove that $||v_k||_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Then it induces a contradiction since $||v_k||_k = 1$ for any k. We prove $||P_kv_k||_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ firstly.

Since

$$(\nabla^2 J_k(\widetilde{u}_k)v_k, P_kv_k)_k = (v_k, P_kv_k) - \int_{Q_k} f'(x,\widetilde{u}_k)v_k \cdot (P_kv_k), \tag{3.16}$$

by (3.12), (3.1) and Lemma 3.3, we get that as $k \to \infty$,

$$\int_{Q_k} f'(x,\widetilde{u}_k)v_k \cdot (P_kv_k) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{Q_k} f'(x,u^i(\cdot + b_k^i))v_k \cdot (P_kv_k) + o(1). \tag{3.17}$$

By (3.17) and the fact that $v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \rightharpoonup 0$ in $H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ (see **Step 2**), we get that as $k \to \infty$, for $i = 1, \cdots, n$,

$$\int_{Q_k} f'(x,u^i(\cdot + b_k^i))v_k \cdot (P_kv_k) = \int_{Q_k} f'(x,u^i)v_k(\cdot - b_k^i) \cdot (P_kv_k)(\cdot - b_k^i) \to 0.$$

Thus as $k \to \infty$,

$$\int_{Q_k} f'(x,\widetilde{u}_k)v_k \cdot (P_kv_k) = o(1). \tag{3.18}$$

By **Step 3**, we get that as $k \to \infty$,

$$(\nabla^2 J_k(\widetilde{u}_k)v_k, P_kv_k)_k \to 0. \tag{3.19}$$

By (3.16), (3.18) and (3.19), we get that as $k \to \infty$,

$$-||P_kv_k||_k^2 = (v_k, P_kv_k)_k \to 0.$$

In the same way, we can prove that $||T_kv_k||_k^2 \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Thus $||v_k||_k = \sqrt{||T_kv_k||_k^2 + ||P_kv_k||_k^2} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. It is a contradiction. This completes the proof of this Lemma. □

Lemma 3.7. *There exists* $k_0 > 0$ *such that for* $k \geq k_0$, $\dim \Lambda_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n} l_i$.

Proof. By the definition of Λ_k, we know that $\dim \Lambda_k \leq \sum_{i=1}^n l_i$. Note that if $i \neq j$, then for any $u_i^k \in N_i^k$, $v_i^k \in N_j^k$ which satisfy that $||u_i^k|| = 1$ and $||v_i^k|| = 1$, $(u_i^k, v_i^k)_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, since $|b_k^i - b_k^j| \to \infty,\ i \neq j$. Thus there exists $k_0 > 0$ such that when $k \geq k_0$, $\chi_k e_{i,j}(\cdot + b_k^i),\ j = 1, \cdots, l_i,\ i = 1, \cdots, n$ are linear independence. Hence $\dim \Lambda_k \geq \sum_{i=1}^n l_i$ when $k \geq k_0$. It follows that $\dim \Lambda_k = \sum_{i=1}^n l_i$ when $k \geq k_0$. □

By Lemma 3.7, we can define an equivalent norm on Λ_k (and $N_i^k,\ \widetilde{N}_i^k,\ \widehat{N}_i^k,\ \widetilde{\Lambda}_k$ as well) by

$$|||h||| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2},$$

where $h = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}(\chi_k e_{i,j})(\cdot + b_k^i) \in \Lambda_k$. In the left part of this section and the next section, we use $|||\cdot|||$ as the norm of Λ_k (and $N_i^k,\ \widetilde{N}_i^k,\ \widehat{N}_i^k,\ \widetilde{\Lambda}_k$ as well).

Lemma 3.8. *There exist $k_0 > 0,\ \delta_0 > 0$ and $\tau_0 > 0$ which are independent of k such that when $k \geq k_0$, the following five statements hold:*

(1). There exists a C^1-mapping

$$w_k : \overline{B_{\Lambda_k}(0,\delta_0)} \to \overline{B_{\Pi_k}(0,\tau_0)}$$

such that $w_k(0) = 0$ and for any $h \in \overline{B_{\Lambda_k}(0,\delta_0)}$, $\widetilde{T}_k \nabla J_k(u_k + w_k(h) + h) = 0$, where $\widetilde{T}_k : E_k \to \Pi_k$ is the orthogonal projection.

(2). There exists a C^1-mapping

$$\widehat{w}_k^i : \overline{B_{\widehat{N}_i^k}(0,\delta_0)} \to \overline{B_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(0,\tau_0)}$$

such that $\widehat{w}_k^i(0) = 0$ and $P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp} \nabla J_k(\widehat{u}_k^i + \widehat{w}_k^i(h) + h) = 0$ for any $h \in \overline{B_{\widehat{N}_i^k}(0,\delta_0)},\ i = 1,2,\cdots,n$, where $P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp} : E_k \to (\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp$ is the orthogonal projection.

(3). There exists a C^1-mapping

$$\omega^i : \overline{B_{N_i}(0,\delta_0)} \to \overline{B_{(N_i)^\perp}(0,\tau_0)}$$

such that $\omega^i(0) = 0$ and $P_{(N_i)^\perp} \nabla J(u^i + \omega^i(h) + h) = 0$ for any $h \in \overline{B_{N_i}(0,\delta_0)},\ i = 1,2,\cdots,n$, where $P_{(N_i)^\perp} : X \to (N_i)^\perp$ is the orthogonal projection.

(4). There exists a C^1-mapping

$$w_k^i : \overline{B_{N_i^k}(0,\delta_0)} \to \overline{B_{(N_i^k)^\perp}(0,\tau_0)}$$

such that $w_k^i(0) = 0$ and $P_{(N_i^k)^\perp} \nabla J_k(u_k^i + w_k^i(h) + h) = 0$ for any $h \in \overline{B_{N_i^k}(0,\delta_0)},\ i = 1,2,\cdots,n$, where $P_{(N_i^k)^\perp} : E_k \to (N_i^k)^\perp$ is the orthogonal projection.

(5). There exists a C^1-mapping

$$\widetilde{w}_k : \overline{B_{\widetilde{\Lambda}_k}(0,\delta_0)} \to \overline{B_{\widetilde{\Pi}_k}(0,\tau_0)}$$

such that $\widetilde{w}_k(0) = 0$ and for any $h \in \overline{B_{\widetilde{\Lambda}_k}(0,\delta_0)}$,

$$P_{\widetilde{\Pi}_k} \nabla J(\sum_{i=1}^{n} u^i(\cdot + b_k^i) + \widetilde{w}_k(h) + h) = 0,$$

where $P_{\widetilde{\Pi}_k} : X \to \widetilde{\Pi}_k$ is the orthogonal projection.

Proof. We only give the prove of result (1), since the proofs of the other results are similar. Set $I_k(w + h) = \widetilde{T}_k \nabla J_k(u_k + w + h)$, then $I_k(0 + 0) = 0$. By Lemma 3.6, we know that there exist $k_0 > 0$ and $\delta_0 > 0$ such that when $k \geq k_0$, $\widetilde{T}_k \nabla I_k|_{\Pi_k} = \widetilde{T}_k \nabla^2 J_k(u_k + w + h)|_{\Pi_k}$ is invertible if $||w + h||_k \leq \delta_0$ and there exits $\eta > 0$ such that $||(\widetilde{T}_k \nabla I_k|_{\Pi_k})^{-1}|| \leq \eta$ for any $k \geq k_0$. Then by the implicit functional theorem, we get that there exist $\tau_0 > 0$ and a C^1-mapping

$$w_k : \overline{B_{\Lambda_k}(0,\delta_0)} \to \overline{B_{\Pi_k}(0,\tau_0)}$$

such that $w_k(0) = 0$ and $I_k(w_k(h) + h) = 0$. □

Remark 3.9. *Since J_k is invariant under the action of $\mathbb{Z}_k^N$, we get that*

$$(\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}))(\cdot + b_k^i) = w_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j}^k). \tag{3.20}$$

If $f : E \to F$ is a C^1 map between two Banach spaces E and F, we denote the derivative operator of f at u by $f'(u)$ and the action of $f'(u)$ on $v \in E$ is denoted by $f'(u)v$. The proofs of the following two Lemmas will be given in appendix.

Lemma 3.10. *For any $1 \le i \le n$, the following two statements hold:*

(1). As $k \to \infty$,

$$\sup\{||\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}) - \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})||_{H^1(Q_k)} \ : \ \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2} \le \delta_0\} \to 0.$$

(2). As $k \to \infty$, for any $1 \le s \le l_i$ and $1 \le i \le n$,

$$\sup\{||(\widehat{w}_k^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})(\chi_k e_{i,s}) - (\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s}||_{H^1(Q_k)} : \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2} \le \delta_0\} \to 0.$$

For $h \in \Lambda_k,\ h = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j}^k$, we denote $h_i = \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j}^k,\ i = 1, \cdots, n.$

Lemma 3.11. *(1). As $k \to \infty$,*

$$\sup\{||w_k(\sum_{i=1}^n h_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n w_k^i(h_i)||_k \ : \ h = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i \in \overline{B_{\Lambda_k}(0, \delta_0)}\} \to 0.$$

(2). As $k \to \infty$, for any $1 \le j \le l_i,\ 1 \le i \le n$,

$$\sup\{||w_k'(\sum_{s=1}^n h_s)e_{i,j}^k - \sum_{s=1}^n (w_k^s)'(h_s)e_{i,j}^k||_k \ : \ h = \sum_{s=1}^n h_s \in \overline{B_{\Lambda_k}(0, \delta_0)}\} \to 0.$$

4 Critical groups of reduction functions

For $x = (x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{1,l_1}, \cdots, x_{n,1}, \cdots, x_{n,l_n}) \in \overline{B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0, \delta_0)}$, we define

$$I_k(x) = J_k(u_k + w_k(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j}^k) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j}^k), \tag{4.1}$$

where $B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0, \delta_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i} : \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2} < \delta_0\}$.

Denote $x_i = (x_{i,1}, \cdots, x_{i,l_i}) \in \overline{B_{\mathbb{R}^{l_i}}(0, \delta_0)}$ and

$$I^i(x_i) = J(u^i + \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j}) + \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j}),\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, n.$$

By (3.1), (3.20), Lemma 3.11 and Lemma 3.10, we have the following Lemma

Lemma 4.1. *As $k \to \infty$, $||I_k(x) - \sum_{i=1}^n I^i(x_i)||_{C^1(\overline{B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0,\delta_0/2)})} \to 0.$*

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{I}_k^i(x_i)=J_k(u_k^i+w_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}e_{i,j}^k)+\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}e_{i,j}^k),\ i=1,2,\cdots,n.$$

Then by Lemma 3.11, we have

$$||I_k(x)-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathcal{I}_k^i(x_i)||_{C^1(\overline{B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0,\delta_0/2)})}\to 0,\ k\to\infty. \tag{4.2}$$

Let

$$\widehat{I}_k^i(x_i)=J_k(\widehat{u}_k^i+\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})+\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}),\ i=1,2,\cdots,n.$$

Then by Lemma 3.10, we get

$$||\widehat{I}_k^i-I^i||_{C^1(\overline{B_{\mathbb{R}^{l_i}}(0,\delta_0/2)})}\to 0,\ k\to\infty,\ i=1,\cdots,n. \tag{4.3}$$

By the invariance of the $\mathbb{Z}_k^N$ action on J_k and (3.20), we have

$$\mathcal{I}_k^i(x_i)\equiv\widehat{I}_k^i(x_i),\ i=1,2,\cdots,n. \tag{4.4}$$

By $(4.2)-(4.4)$ we get the result of this Lemma. □

By the properties of w_k and ω^i, we have the following Lemma

Lemma 4.2. *(1). If $x^0\in B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0,\delta_0/2)$ is a critical point of I_k, then*

$$u_k+w_k(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}^0e_{i,j}^k)+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}^0e_{i,j}^k$$

is a critical point of J_k.

(2). If $x^0\in B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0,\delta_0/2)$ is a critical point of I^i, then

$$u^i+\omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}^0e_{i,j})+\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}^0e_{i,j}$$

is a critical point of J.

Proof. We only give the proof of result (1), since the proof of result (2) is similar. If $x^0\in B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0,\delta_0/2)$ is a critical point of I_k, then for any $x_{s,t}$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial I_k(x^0)}{\partial x_{s,t}}\\ &= \left(\nabla J_k(u_k+w_k(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}^0e_{i,j}^k)+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}^0e_{i,j}^k),\ w_k'(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}^0e_{i,j}^k)e_{s,t}^k\right)_k\\ &\quad+\left(\nabla J_k(u_k+w_k(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}^0e_{i,j}^k)+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}^0e_{i,j}^k),\ e_{s,t}^k\right)_k \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Since $w_k'(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}^0e_{i,j}^k)e_{s,t}^k\in\Pi_k$, by the result (1) of Lemma 3.8, we get that

$$\left(\nabla J_k(u_k+w_k(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}^0e_{i,j}^k)+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}^0e_{i,j}^k),\ w_k'(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}^0e_{i,j}^k)e_{s,t}^k\right)_k=0. \tag{4.6}$$

By (4.5) and (4.6), we get that for any $1\le t\le l_s$, $1\le s\le n$,

$$\left(\nabla J_k(u_k+w_k(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x^0_{i,j}e^k_{i,j})+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x^0_{i,j}e^k_{i,j}),\ e^k_{s,t}\right)_k=0. \tag{4.7}$$

By (4.7) and the result (1) of Lemma 3.8, we know that

$$u_k+w_k(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x^0_{i,j}e^k_{i,j})+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x^0_{i,j}e^k_{i,j}$$

is a critical point of J_k. $\square$

Remark 4.3. *By the condition* **(*)** *and Lemma* 4.2*, we know that* 0 *is the unique critical point of* $I^i(x_i)$ *in* $\overline{B_{\mathbb{R}^{l_i}}(0,\delta_0)}$, $i=1,\cdots,n$.

By Lemma 3.6, we know that $\widetilde{T}_k\circ\nabla^2 J_k(u_k)$ is a bounded, invertible and self-adjoint operator in Hilbert space Π_k. Let P_k^+ (resp. P_k^-) be the orthogonal projection from E_k into the positive (resp. negative) subspace Π_k^+ (resp. Π_k^-) with respect to the spectral decomposition of $\widetilde{T}_k\circ\nabla^2 J_k(u_k)$. By Lemma 1 of [9], we have the following Lemma:

Lemma 4.4. *For any* $u\in\overline{B_{E_k}(u_k,\delta_0/2)}$, u *has the unique decomposition* $u=u_k+w+h$ *where* $w\in\Pi_k$ *and* $h\in\Lambda_k$. *There exist a diffeomorphism* $\Psi_k:\overline{B_{E_k}(u_k,\delta_0/2)}\to E_k$ *which satisfies that* $\Psi(u_k)=u_k$ *such that for any* $u=u_k+w+\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}e^k_{i,j}\in\overline{B_{E_k}(u_k,\delta_0/2)}$,

$$J_k(\Psi_k(u))=||P_k^+w||_k^2-||P_k^-w||_k^2+J_k(u_k+w_k(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}e^k_{i,j})+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}e^k_{i,j}).$$

Remark 4.5. *By Lemma* 2.8*, we know that if* k *large enough, then* $K_k^{(i_k)}\subset B_{E_k}(u_k,\delta_0/2)$. *Let* $\mathcal{K}_k:=\{x\in\overline{B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0,\delta_0/2)}$: *there exists* $u\in K_k^{(i_k)}$, *such that* $P_{\Lambda_k}(u-u_k)=\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^{l_i}x_{i,j}e^k_{i,j}\}$, *where* $P_{\Lambda_k}:E_k\to\Lambda_k$ *is the orthogonal projection. Then by Lemma* 4.2, $\mathcal{K}_k$ *is the critical set of* I_k *in* $\overline{B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0,\delta_0/2)}$. *By Lemma* 2.8*, we know that diam*$(\mathcal{K}_k)\to 0$ *as* $k\to\infty$.

Lemma 4.6. *If* k *large enough, then there exists integer* $\widehat{m}_k$ *which satisfies that* $0\le\widehat{m}_k\le\sum_{i=1}^n l_i$ *such that* $C_{\widehat{m}_k}(I_k,\mathcal{K}_k)\ne 0$.

Proof. Let (W_1,W_1^-) and (W_2,W_2^-) be the GM-pairs for the functionals $\mathcal{J}_k(w+h)=||w||_k^2-||h||_k^2$ in the unique critical point 0 and I_k in the critical set $\mathcal{K}_k$ respectively. Then by [5, Lemma 5.1], we know that $(W_1\times W_2,(W_1^-\times W_2)\cup(W_1\times W_2^-))$ is a GM-pair for the isolated critical set $\Psi_k^{-1}(K_k^{(i_k)})$ of the functional $J_k\circ\Psi_k$. Then by Theorem 5.5 of [5], we get that

$$C_*(J_k\circ\Psi_k,\Psi_k^{-1}(K_k^{(i_k)}))=C_*(\mathcal{J}_k,0)\otimes C_*(I_k,\mathcal{K}_k). \tag{4.8}$$

Since $C_q(\mathcal{J}_k,0)=\delta_{q,\dim\widetilde{\Pi}_k^-}\mathbb{Z}_2$, by (4.8), we get that

$$C_q(I_k,\mathcal{K}_k)=C_{q+\dim\widetilde{\Pi}_k^-}(J_k\circ\Psi_k,\Psi_k^{-1}(K_k^{(i_k)})). \tag{4.9}$$

Since $C_*(J_k\circ\Psi_k,\Psi_k^{-1}(K_k^{(i_k)})\cong C_*(J_k,K_k^{(i_k)})$, by (4.9), we get that

$$C_q(I_k,\mathcal{K}_k)\cong C_{q+\dim\widetilde{\Pi}_k^-}(J_k,K_k^{(i_k)}). \tag{4.10}$$

By Lemma 2.17 and (4.10), we have $C_{j(k)-\dim\widetilde{\Pi}_k^-+1}(I_k,\mathcal{K}_k)\cong C_{j(k)+1}(J_k,K_k^{(i_k)})\ne 0$. Let $\widehat{m}_k=j(k)-\dim\widetilde{\Pi}_k^-+1$. Notice that I_k is a function defined in some subset of $\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}$, we get that $C_q(I_k,\mathcal{K}_k)=0$ if $q>\sum_{i=1}^n l_i$. Thus $0\le\widehat{m}_k\le\sum_{i=1}^n l_i$. $\square$

Lemma 4.7. *Let* (W, W_-) *be a GM-pair of the isolated critical point* 0 *of* $\sum_{i=1}^{n} I^i(x_i)$ *with respect to* $-d(\sum_{i=1}^n I^i(x_i))$ *and* $W \subset B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0, \delta_0/2)$. *If* k *large enough, then* (W, W_-) *is also a GM-pair of the isolated critical set* $\mathcal{K}_k$ *of* I_k *with respect to certain pseudo-gradient vector field of* I_k.

Proof. Since $\text{diam}(\mathcal{K}_k) \to 0$, as $k \to \infty$, we know that there exists $r > 0$ such that if k large enough, then $B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0, r) \subset \text{int}(W)$, the interior of W, and $\mathcal{K}_k \subset B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0, r/4)$. Note that

$$\beta := \inf\{||d(\sum_{i=1}^{n} I^i(x_i))|| \ : \ x \in W \setminus B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0, r/2)\} > 0.$$

Define $\rho \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}, \mathbb{R})$ satisfying

$$\rho(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0, r/2) \\ 0, & x \notin B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0, r), \end{cases}$$

with $0 \le \rho(x) \le 1$ and a vector field

$$V(x) = \frac{3}{2}(\rho(x) dI_k(x) + (1 - \rho(x)) d(\sum_{i=1}^{n} I^i(x_i))).$$

Choosing $0 < \epsilon < \beta/4$, by Lemma 4.1, we know that if k large enough, then

$$||I_k(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{k} I^i(x_i)||_{C^1(\overline{B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0,\delta_0)})} < \epsilon. \tag{4.11}$$

We shall prove that $||V(x)|| \le 2||dI_k(x)||$ and $(V(x), dI_k(x)) \ge ||d(I_k(x))||^2$, where $(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the inner product in $\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}$.

By (4.11), we know that for any $x \notin B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0, r/2)$,

$$||dI_k(x)|| \ge ||d(\sum_{i=1}^{n} I^i(x_i))|| - \epsilon \ge \beta - \epsilon > 3\epsilon. \tag{4.12}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (V(x), dI_k(x)) \\ = & \left(\frac{3}{2}(\rho(x) dI_k(x) + (1-\rho(x)) d(\sum_{i=1}^{n} I^i(x_i))),\ dI_k(x)\right) \\ = & \left(\frac{3}{2}(dI_k(x) + (1-\rho(x))(d(\sum_{i=1}^{n} I^i(x_i)) - dI_k(x))),\ dI_k(x)\right) \\ \ge & \frac{3}{2}(||dI_k(x)||^2 - \epsilon ||dI_k(x)||) \qquad (\text{by } (4.11)) \\ \ge & \frac{3}{2}(||dI_k(x)||^2 - \frac{1}{3}||dI_k(x)||^2) \\ = & ||dI_k(x)||^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} ||V(x)|| &= ||\frac{3}{2}((1-\rho(x)) d(\sum_{i=1}^{n} I^i(x_i)) + \rho(x) dI_k(x))|| \\ &\le \frac{3}{2}(||dI_k(x)|| + \epsilon) \\ &\le 2||dI_k(x)|| \qquad (\text{by } (4.12)). \end{aligned}$$

Since for any $x \in B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0, r/2),\ V(x) = dI_k(x)$, the verification is trivial.

Notice that $V(x) = -d(\sum_{i=1}^n I^i(x_i))$ outside a ball $B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0, r) \subset \mathrm{int}(W)$. It is not difficult to verify that (W, W_-) is a GM-pair of $I_k(x)$ with respect to V. □

Lemma 4.8. *There exist an index i_0 satisfying $1 \le i_0 \le n$ and a nonnegative integer m_0 satisfying $0 \le m_0 \le \sum_{i=1}^n l_i$ such that $C_{m_0}(I^{i_0}, 0) \neq 0$.*

Proof. Let (W, W^-) be a GM-pair of $\sum_{i=1}^n I^i(x_i)$ for the isolated critical point 0 which satisfies that $W \subset B_{\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}}(0, \delta_0/4)$. Then by Lemma 4.7, we know that (W, W^-) is also a GM-pair of I_k for the isolated critical set $\mathcal{K}_k$ if k large enough. Thus by Lemma 2.16 and Lemma 4.6, we get that

$$C_{\widehat{m}_k}(\sum_{i=1}^n I^i(x_i), 0) = H_{\widehat{m}_k}(W, W_-) = C_{\widehat{m}_k}(I_k, \mathcal{K}_k) \neq 0. \tag{4.13}$$

By [5, Theorem 5.5], we get that

$$C_*(\sum_{i=1}^n I^i(x_i), 0) = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n C_*(I^i, 0). \tag{4.14}$$

The result of this Lemma follows from (4.13) and (4.14). □

5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

If the condition **(*)** does not hold, then Equation (1.1) has infinitely many geometrically different solutions and the proof terminates. In the following, we always assume that the condition **(*)** holds.

We denote u^{i_0} by u_0, where i_0 is the index appeared in Lemma 4.8. By the condition **(*)**, we know that u_0 is an isolated critical point of J. We will use u_0 as a basic "one-bump" solution to construct multi-bump solutions for equation (1.1).

For positive integer $m \ge 2$ and $b_i \in \mathbb{Z}^N,\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, denote $u_{b_i} = u_0(x - b_i),\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$. For $\mathbf{k} = (b_1, \cdots, b_m) \in (\mathbb{Z}^N)^m$, denote $u_{\mathbf{k}} = \sum_{i=1}^m u_{b_i}$ and let $l_{\mathbf{k}} = \min\{|b_i - b_j| \ :\ i \neq j\}$. Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the kernel of $\nabla^2 J(u_0)$ and let $\mathcal{N} = \mathrm{span}\{e_1, \cdots, e_l\}$, where $l = \dim \mathcal{N}$ and $e_i,\ i = 1, \cdots, l$ satisfy $(e_i, e_j)_X = \delta_{i,j}$. Let $\mathcal{N}_{b_i}$ be the kernel of $\nabla^2 J(u_{b_i}),\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, then $\mathcal{N}_{b_i} = \mathrm{span}\{e_1(\cdot - b_i), \cdots, e_l(\cdot - b_i)\}$. Let $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}} = \mathrm{span}\{\mathcal{N}_{b_i} \ :\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, m\}$ and $Z_{\mathbf{k}} = (\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{k}})^\perp \subset X$.

As the same argument as Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 4.2, we have the following two Lemmas:

Lemma 5.1. *There exist $\delta > 0$ and a C^1-mapping $\omega : \overline{B_{\mathbb{R}^l}(0, \delta)} \to \mathcal{N}^\perp$ such that*

(1). $P_{\mathcal{N}^\perp} \nabla J(u_0 + \omega(x_1, \cdots, x_l) + \sum_{i=1}^l x_i e_i) = 0$ and $\omega(0) = 0$, where $P_{\mathcal{N}^\perp} : X \to \mathcal{N}^\perp$ is the orthogonal projection.

(2). If $(x_1^0, \cdots, x_l^0)$ is a critical point of $J(u_0 + \omega(x_1, \cdots, x_l) + \sum_{i=1}^l x_i e_i)$, then $u_0 + \omega(x_1, \cdots, x_l) + \sum_{i=1}^l x_i e_i$ is a critical point of J.

Lemma 5.2. *There exist $L > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that if $l_{\mathbf{k}} > L$, then there is a C^1-mapping $w_{\mathbf{k}} : \overline{B_{\mathbb{R}^{ml}}(0, \delta)} \to Z_{\mathbf{k}}$ satisfying that*

(1). $P_{Z_{\mathbf{k}}} \nabla J(u_{\mathbf{k}} + w_{\mathbf{k}}(x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{1,l}, \cdots, x_{m,1}, \cdots, x_{m,l}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^l x_{i,j} e_j(\cdot - b_i)) = 0$.

(2). if $(x_{1,1}^0, \cdots, x_{m,l}^0)$ is a critical point of

$$J(u_{\mathbf{k}} + w_{\mathbf{k}}(x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{1,l}, \cdots, x_{m,1}, \cdots, x_{m,l}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^l x_{i,j} e_j(\cdot - b_i))$$

then $u_{\mathbf{k}} + w_{\mathbf{k}}(x^0_{1,1}, \cdots, x^0_{1,l}, \cdots, x^0_{m,1}, \cdots, x^0_{m,l}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^l x^0_{i,j} e_j(\cdot - b_i)$ *is a critical point of* J.

Let $H_{\mathbf{k}}(x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{m,l}) = J(u_{\mathbf{k}} + w_{\mathbf{k}}(x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{m,l}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^l x_{i,j} e_j(\cdot - b_i))$ and $H(x_1, \cdots, x_l) = J(u_0 + \omega(x_1, \cdots, x_l) + \sum_{j=1}^l x_j e_j)$. Let $x = (x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{m,l})$ and $x_i = (x_{i,1}, \cdots, x_{i,l}),\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, m$.

Remark 5.3. *By the condition* **(*)**, *we know that* u_0 *is an isolated critical point of* J. *Then by Lemma* 5.1, *we know that* 0 *is the unique critical point of* H *in* $\overline{B_{\mathbb{R}^l}(0,\delta)}$.

As the same argument as Lemma 4.1, we have the following Lemma:

Lemma 5.4. *There exists* $\delta > 0$ *such that as* $l_{\mathbf{k}} \to \infty$,

$$||H_{\mathbf{k}}(x) - \sum_{i=1}^m H(x_i)||_{C^1(\overline{B_{\mathbb{R}^{ml}}(0,\delta)})} \to 0.$$

Note that $H(x) = I^{i_0}(x)$ for $x \in \overline{B_{\mathbb{R}^l}(0,\delta)}$. By Lemma 4.8, we know that $C_{m_0}(I^{i_0}, 0) \neq 0$. Thus we have the following Lemma:

Lemma 5.5. $C_{m_0}(H, 0) \neq 0$.

By Lemma 5.5 and $C_{mm_0}(\sum_{i=1}^m H(x_i), 0) = \bigotimes_{i=1}^m C_{m_0}(H(x_i), 0)$ (see (4.14) for reference), we get that the following Lemma:

Lemma 5.6. $C_{mm_0}(\sum_{i=1}^m H(x_i), 0) \neq 0$.

By Lemma 5.6 and Lemma 5.4, we have the following Lemma

Lemma 5.7. *If* $l_{\mathbf{k}}$ *large enough, then* $H_{\mathbf{k}}$ *has at least a critical point* $x^{\mathbf{k}} \in B_{\mathbb{R}^{ml}}(0,\delta)$ *which satisfies that* $x^{\mathbf{k}} \to 0$ *as* $l_{\mathbf{k}} \to \infty$.

Proof. Let (W, W_-) be a GM-pair of the isolated critical point 0 of $\sum_{i=1}^m H(x_i)$ with respective to the gradient field $-d(\sum_{i=1}^m H(x_i))$. By Lemma 5.4 and the proof of Lemma 4.7, we know that when $l_{\mathbf{k}}$ large enough, if η is the flow generalized by the following ordinary differential equation

$$\dot{\eta} = V_1(\eta(x,t)),\ \eta(x,0) = x,$$

where $V_1(x) = g(x)\frac{V(x)}{||V(x)||}$, $V(x) = \frac{3}{2}(\rho(x) dH_{\mathbf{k}}(x) + (1-\rho(x)) d(\sum_{i=1}^n H(x_i)))$, $\rho \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i=1}^n l_i}, \mathbb{R})$ satisfying $0 \le \rho(x) \le 1$ for any x and

$$\rho(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in B_{\mathbb{R}^{ml}}(0, \delta/4) \\ 0, & x \notin B_{\mathbb{R}^{ml}}(0, \delta/2), \end{cases}$$

and $g(x) = \begin{cases} \min\{\text{dist}(x, K_{H_{\mathbf{k}}}), 1\}, & \text{if } K_{H_{\mathbf{k}}} \neq \emptyset \\ 1, & \text{if } K_{H_{\mathbf{k}}} = \emptyset, \end{cases}$ then (W, W_-) satisfies the following conditions:

(1). W has the (MVP) property with respect to the flow η.

(2). W_- is an exit set for W, i.e., for each $x_0 \in W$ and $t_1 > 0$ such that $\eta(x_0, t_1) \notin W$, there exists $t_0 \in [0, t_1)$ such that $\eta(x_0, [0, t_0]) \subset W$ and $\eta(x_0, t_0) \in W_-$.

(3). W_- is closed and is a union of a finite number of sub-manifolds that transversal to the flow η.

If $H_{\mathbf{k}}$ has no critical point in W, then for any $x \in B_{\mathbb{R}^{ml}}(0,\delta)$

$$g(x) \geq \iota \text{ and } ||V(x)|| \geq \iota \tag{5.1}$$

for some $\iota > 0$. Thus for any $x \in W$, there exists $t \geq 0$ such that $\eta(x,t) \notin W$. In fact, if there exists $x \in W$ such that for any $t \geq 0$, $\eta(x,t) \in W$, then by the fact that W is a bounded closed set in finite dimension space $\mathbb{R}^{ml}$, we deduce that there exists a sequence $\{t_n\}$ such that $t_n \to +\infty$ as $n \to \infty$ and $\eta(x,t_n)$ converges to some point $x_0 \in W$. Then x_0 must satisfy that $V_1(x_0) = 0$. It contradicts to (5.1). Thus for any $x \in W$, $t_x = \inf\{t' \geq 0 \ : \ \eta(x,t') \in W_-\} < +\infty$. It is easy to verify that $t_x = 0$ for any $x \in W_-$. Define $\mathcal{H} : W \times [0,1] \to W$, $\mathcal{H}(x,s) = \eta(x, st_x)$. It follows that W_- is a deformation retract of W. Thus $H_q(W,W_-) = 0$, $\forall q$. But (W,W_-) is a GM-pair of the isolated critical point 0 of $\sum_{i=1}^m H(x_i)$, by Lemma 2.16 and Lemma 5.6, we get that

$$H_{mm_0}(W,W_-) \cong C_{mm_0}(\sum_{i=1}^m H(x_i), 0) \neq 0.$$

It is a contradiction. Thus if $l_{\mathbf{k}}$ large enough, then $H_{\mathbf{k}}$ has at least a critical point $x^{\mathbf{k}}$ in $B_{\mathbb{R}^{ml}}(0,\delta)$. Finally, by Lemma 5.4 and Remark 5.3, we get that $x^{\mathbf{k}} \to 0$ as $l_{\mathbf{k}} \to \infty$. □

By Lemma 5.7 and Lemma 5.2, we get the following result:

Theorem 5.8. *$u_{\mathbf{k}} + w_{\mathbf{k}}(x^{\mathbf{k}}_{1,1}, \cdots, x^{\mathbf{k}}_{m,l}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^l x^{\mathbf{k}}_{i,j} e_j(\cdot - b_i)$ is a critical point of J. Furthermore, as $l_{\mathbf{k}} \to +\infty$, $w_{\mathbf{k}}(x^{\mathbf{k}}_{1,1}, \cdots, x^{\mathbf{k}}_{m,l}) \to 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^l x^{\mathbf{k}}_{i,j} e_j(\cdot - b_i) \to 0$.*

6 Appendix

In this Section, we shall give the proofs of Lemma 3.1, Lemma 3.3, Lemma 3.10 and Lemma 3.11. The proof of Lemma 3.2 is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.1 and the proof of Lemma 3.4 is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.3.

Proof of Lemma 3.1:

For convenience, we set

$$v_k = \sum_{i=1}^n u^i(\cdot + b^i_k) - u_k,$$

by (3.1), we have

$$||v_k||_{H^1(Q_k)} \to 0 \ \text{ as } k \to \infty. \tag{6.1}$$

Let

$$\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} = \{x \in Q_k \ : \ |u_k(x)| \leq 1/\epsilon\},\ \Omega^1_{\epsilon,k} = \{x \in Q_k \ : \ |u_k(x)| > 1/\epsilon\},$$

and

$$U^0_{\epsilon,k} = \{x \in Q_k \ : \ |v_k(x)| < \epsilon\},\ U^1_{\epsilon,k} = \{x \in Q_k \ : \ |v_k(x)| \geq \epsilon\}.$$

By $||v_k||_{H^1(Q_k)} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, we get that for every $\epsilon > 0$

$$\text{mes}(U^1_{\epsilon,k}) \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty \tag{6.2}$$

and by the fact that $\{u_k\}$ is bounded in $H^1(Q_k)$, we get that as $\epsilon \to 0$,

$$\text{mes}(\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k}) \to 0, \tag{6.3}$$

holds uniformly for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, here mes(A) denotes the Lebesgue measure of the set A.

By the definition of v_k and $\Omega^i_{\epsilon,k}$ and $U^i_{\epsilon,k},\ i=0,1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{Q_k} |f'(x, \sum_{i=1}^{n} u^i(\cdot + b^i_k)) - f'(x,u_k)| \cdot |\psi_k| \cdot |\varphi_k| dx \\
= & \int_{Q_k} |f'(x, u_k + v_k) - f'(x,u_k)| \cdot |\psi_k| \cdot |\varphi_k| dx \\
\leq & \int_{U^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap \Omega^0_{\epsilon,k}} + \int_{\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k}} + \int_{U^1_{\epsilon,k}} . \qquad (6.4)
\end{aligned}$$

By the condition $(\mathbf{f_2})$ and Hölder inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{U^1_{\epsilon,k}} |f'(x, u_k + v_k) - f'(x,u_k)| \cdot |\varphi_k| \cdot |\psi_k| dx \\
\leq & \ C \int_{U^1_{\epsilon,k}} |u_k + v_k|^{q-2} \cdot |\varphi_k| \cdot |\psi_k| dx + C \int_{U^1_{\epsilon,k}} |u_k + v_k|^{p-2} \cdot |\varphi_k| \cdot |\psi_k| dx \\
& + C \int_{U^1_{\epsilon,k}} |u_k|^{q-2} \cdot |\varphi_k| \cdot |\psi_k| dx + C \int_{U^1_{\epsilon,k}} |u_k|^{p-2} \cdot |\varphi_k| \cdot |\psi_k| dx
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{U^1_{\epsilon,k}} |u_k + v_k|^{q-2} \cdot |\varphi_k| \cdot |\psi_k| dx \\
\leq & \ (\int_{U^1_{\epsilon}} 1^r dx)^{\frac{1}{r}} \cdot (\int_{U^1_{\epsilon,k}} |u_k + v_k|^{q+(q-2)\delta'})^{\frac{1}{\delta' + \frac{q}{q-2}}} \cdot (\int_{U^1_{\epsilon,k}} |\varphi_k|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}} \cdot (\int_{U^1_{\epsilon,k}} |\psi_k|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $q+(q-2)\delta' \leq 2^*$ and $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{\delta' + \frac{q}{q-2}} + \frac{2}{q} = 1$. It follows that there exists $C'_1 > 0$ which is independent of $k,\ \psi_k$ and φ_k such that

$$\int_{U^1_{\epsilon,k}} |u_k + v_k|^{q-2} |\psi_k \cdot \varphi_k| dx \leq C'_1 (\text{mes}(U^1_{\epsilon,k}))^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

Thus there exists $C_1 > 0$ which is independent of $k,\ \psi_k$ and φ_k such that

$$\int_{U^1_{\epsilon,k}} |f'(x, u_k + v_k) - f'(x,u_k)| \cdot |\psi_k \cdot \varphi_k| dx \leq C_1 (\text{mes}(U^1_{\epsilon,k}))^{\frac{1}{r}}. \qquad (6.5)$$

In the same way, there exists $C_2 > 0$ which is independent of $k,\ \psi_k$ and φ_k such that

$$\int_{\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k}} |f'(x, u_k + v_k) - f'(x,u_k)| \cdot |\psi_k \cdot \varphi_k| dx \leq C_2 (\text{mes}(\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k}))^{\frac{1}{r}}. \qquad (6.6)$$

Choose $\eta \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R})$ which satisfies that $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $|\eta'(t)| \leq 2$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta(t) dt = 1$, $\eta \equiv 1$ in $(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\eta \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R} \setminus (-1,1)$. Let $\eta_\delta(t) = \frac{1}{\delta} \eta(\frac{t}{\delta})$ and

$$g_\delta(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f'_s(x,s) \eta_\delta(t-s) ds.$$

Since $f'(x,t)$ is a Caratheodory function, we deduce that for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} g_\delta(x,t) = f'(x,t). \qquad (6.7)$$

We shall prove that for every $\epsilon \in (0,1)$, the following limit holds uniformly for $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |f'(x, u_k + v_k) - g_\delta(x, u_k + v_k)|^{\frac{q}{q-2}} dx = 0. \qquad (6.8)$$

If not, then there exist $\epsilon_0 > 0,\ \eta_0 > 0$ and sequences $\{\delta_m\},\ \{k_m\}$ which satisfy that $\delta_m \to 0$ and

$$\int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}\cap U^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}} |f'(x,u_{k_m}+v_{k_m}) - g_{\delta_m}(x,u_{k_m}+v_{k_m})|^{\frac{q}{q-2}}dx > \eta_0,\ m=1,2,\cdots. \tag{6.9}$$

By the condition $(\mathbf{f_2})$ and the definition of g_{δ_m}, we know that there exist $C, C' > 0$ which are independent of m such that

$$\begin{aligned} & |f'(x,u_{k_m}(x)+v_{k_m}(x)) - g_{\delta_m}(x,u_{k_m}(x)+v_{k_m}(x))|^{\frac{q}{q-2}} \\ \le\ & C'|u_{k_m}(x)+v_{k_m}(x)|^q \\ \le\ & C(\frac{1}{\epsilon_0^q} + |v_k(x)|^q),\ \forall x \in \Omega^1_{\epsilon_0,k_m}\cap U^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

By (6.7), we get that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} |f'(x,u_{k_m}(x)+v_{k_m}(x)) - g_{\delta_m}(x,u_{k_m}(x)+v_{k_m}(x))|^{\frac{q}{q-2}} = 0\ a.e. \tag{6.11}$$

Moreover, by the fact that there exists constant $C > 0$ which is independent of m such that

$$\epsilon_0^q \text{mes}(\Omega^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}\cap U^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}) \le \int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}\cap U^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}} |u_{k_m}|^q \le \int_{Q_k} |u_{k_m}|^q \le C \tag{6.12}$$

we get that there exists constant $C > 0$ which is independent of m such that

$$\text{mes}(\Omega^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}\cap U^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}) \le C. \tag{6.13}$$

By (6.13), we may assume that the limit $\lim_{m\to\infty}\text{mes}(\Omega^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}\cap U^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m})$ exists. By (6.10) and Fatou theorem, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}\cap U^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}} \liminf_{m\to\infty}(C(\frac{1}{\epsilon_0^q}+|v_k|^q) - |f'(x,u_{k_m}(x)+v_{k_m}(x)) - g_{\delta_m}(x,u_{k_m}(x)+v_{k_m}(x))|^{\frac{q}{q-2}})dx \\ \le\ & \liminf_{m\to\infty}\int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}\cap U^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}} (C(\frac{1}{\epsilon_0^q}+|v_k|^q) - |f'(x,u_{k_m}(x)+v_{k_m}(x)) - g_{\delta_m}(x,u_{k_m}(x)+v_{k_m}(x))|^{\frac{q}{q-2}})dx \end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

By the fact that $\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{Q_k}|v_k|^q = 0$ and (6.14), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & C\frac{1}{\epsilon_0^q}\lim_{m\to\infty}\text{mes}(\Omega^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}\cap U^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}) - \int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}\cap U^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}} \lim_{m\to\infty}|f'(x,u_{k_m}+v_{k_m}) - g_{\delta_m}(x,u_{k_m}+v_{k_m})|^{\frac{q}{q-2}}dx \\ \le\ & C\frac{1}{\epsilon_0^q}\lim_{m\to\infty}\text{mes}(\Omega^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}\cap U^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}) - \limsup_{m\to\infty}\int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}\cap U^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}} |f'(x,u_{k_m}+v_{k_m}) - g_{\delta_m}(x,u_{k_m}+v_{k_m})|^{\frac{q}{q-2}}dx \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

By (6.15) and (6.11), we get that

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}\int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}\cap U^0_{\epsilon_0,k_m}} |f'(x,u_{k_m}+v_{k_m}) - g_{\delta_m}(x,u_{k_m}+v_{k_m})|^{\frac{q}{q-2}}dx = 0. \tag{6.16}$$

It contradicts to (6.9). Thus (6.8) holds uniformly for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then by (6.8) and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k}\cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |f'(x,u_k+v_k) - g_\delta(x,u_k+v_k)|\cdot|\psi_k\cdot\varphi_k|dx \\ \le\ & (\int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k}\cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |f'(x,u_k+v_k) - g_\delta(x,u_k+v_k)|^{\frac{q}{q-2}}dx)^{\frac{q-2}{q}}(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}|\psi_k|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}|\varphi_k|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ \le\ & C(\int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k}\cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |f'(x,u_k+v_k) - g_\delta(x,u_k+v_k)|^{\frac{q}{q-2}}dx)^{\frac{q-2}{q}} \end{aligned} \tag{6.17}$$

we get that the following limit holds uniformly for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $||\varphi_k||_k \leq 1$ and $||\psi_k||_k \leq 1$,

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |f'(x, u_k + v_k) - g_\delta(x, u_k + v_k)| \cdot |\psi_k \cdot \varphi_k| dx = 0. \tag{6.18}$$

As the same argument as (6.18), we get that the following limit holds uniformly for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $||\varphi_k||_k \leq 1$ and $||\psi_k||_k \leq 1$,

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |f'(x, u_k) - g_\delta(x, u_k)| \cdot |\psi_k \cdot \varphi_k| dx = 0. \tag{6.19}$$

By the definition of $g_\delta(x,t)$ and the condition $(\mathbf{f_2})$, we get that for all $t \in [-2/\epsilon, 2/\epsilon]$, there exists constant $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$|\frac{\partial g_\delta}{\partial t}(x,t)| = |\int_{\mathbb{R}} f'(x,s) \frac{\partial \eta_\delta}{\partial s}(t-s) ds| \leq C_\epsilon/\delta. \tag{6.20}$$

By (6.20), we get that for all $x \in \Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}$,

$$|g_\delta(x, u_k(x) + v_k(x)) - g_\delta(x, u_k(x))| \leq \frac{C_\epsilon}{\delta} |v_k(x)|. \tag{6.21}$$

If $q - 2 \leq 1$, then there exists constant $C(\epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$|g_\delta(x, u_k(x) + v_k(x)) - g_\delta(x, u_k(x))| \leq \frac{C_\epsilon}{\delta} |v_k(x)| \leq \frac{C(\epsilon)}{\delta} |v_k(x)|^{q-2}, \ \forall x \in \Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |g_\delta(x, u_k + v_k) - g_\delta(x, u_k)| \cdot |\psi_k \cdot \varphi_k| dx \\ \leq\ & \frac{C(\epsilon)}{\delta} \int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |v_k|^{q-2} |\varphi_k \cdot \psi_k| dx \\ \leq\ & \frac{C(\epsilon)}{\delta} (\int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |v_k|^q)^{\frac{q-2}{q}} (\int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |\varphi_k|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}} (\int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |\psi_k|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ \leq\ & \frac{C_2(\epsilon)}{\delta} ||v_k||^{q-2}_{H^1(Q_k)}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

where $C_2(\epsilon) > 0$ is a constant which is independent of $\psi_k,\ \varphi_k$ and k.

If $q - 2 > 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |g_\delta(x, u_k + v_k) - g_\delta(x, u_k)| \cdot |\psi_k \cdot \varphi_k| dx \\ \leq\ & \frac{C_\epsilon}{\delta} \int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |v_k| \cdot |\varphi_k \cdot \psi_k| dx \\ \leq\ & \frac{C_\epsilon}{\delta} (\int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |v_k|^3)^{\frac{1}{3}} (\int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |\psi_k|^3)^{\frac{1}{3}} (\int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |\varphi_k|^3)^{\frac{1}{3}} \\ \leq\ & \frac{C'_2(\epsilon)}{\delta} (\int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |v_k|^3)^{\frac{1}{3}} \\ \leq\ & \frac{C''_2(\epsilon)}{\delta} ||v_k||_{H^1(Q_k)}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.23}$$

where $C''_2(\epsilon) > 0$ is a constant which is independent of $\psi_k,\ \varphi_k$ and k.

By (6.22) and (6.23), we get that the following limit holds uniformly for $||\varphi_k||_k \leq 1$ and $||\psi_k||_k \leq 1$,

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |g_\delta(x, u_k + v_k) - g_\delta(x, u_k)| \cdot |\psi_k \cdot \varphi_k| dx = 0. \tag{6.24}$$

By (6.18), (6.19) and (6.24), we get that the following limit holds uniformly for $||\varphi_k||_k \leq 1$ and $||\psi_k||_k \leq 1$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\Omega^0_{\epsilon,k}\cap U^0_{\epsilon,k}} |f'(x,u_k+v_k)-f'(x,u_k)|\cdot|\psi_k\cdot\varphi_k|dx = 0. \tag{6.25}$$

Finally, by (6.2), (6.3), (6.5), (6.6) and (6.25), we get that the limit

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{Q_k} |f'(x,u_k+v_k)-f'(x,u_k)|\cdot|\psi_k\cdot\varphi_k|dx = 0$$

holds uniformly for $||\varphi_k||_k \leq 1$ and $||\psi_k||_k \leq 1$. □

Proof of Lemma 3.3:

Firstly, we shall prove that as $k\to\infty$, the limit

$$\int_{Q_k} |f'(x,u^1-\sum_{i=2}^n u^i(\cdot+b^i_k-b^1_k))-f'(x,\sum_{i=2}^n u^i(\cdot+b^i_k-b^1_k))-f'(x,u^1)|\cdot|\varphi_k\cdot\psi_k| \to 0 \tag{6.26}$$

holds uniformly for $\varphi_k,\varphi_k\in E_k$ which satisfy $||\varphi_k||_k\leq 1,\ ||\psi_k||_k\leq 1.$

For convenience, we set $v_k = \sum_{i=2}^n u^i(\cdot+b^i_k-b^1_k)$.

Let $\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k} = \{x\in Q_k\ :\ |v_k(x)|\leq 1/\epsilon\}$, $\Omega^2_{\epsilon,k} = \{x\in Q_k\ :\ |v_k(x)|> 1/\epsilon\}$,

$$U^1_\epsilon = \{x\in Q_k\ :\ |u^1(x)|\leq 1/\epsilon\},\ U^2_\epsilon = \{x\in Q_k\ :\ |u^1(x)|> 1/\epsilon\}.$$

Then the limit

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to0}\text{mes}(\Omega^2_{\epsilon,k}) = 0, \tag{6.27}$$

holds uniformly for $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and

$$\text{mes}(U^2_\epsilon)\to 0,\ \text{as } \epsilon\to 0. \tag{6.28}$$

Note that

$$\int_{Q_k} |f'(x,u^1+v_k)-f'(x,v_k)-f'(x,u^1)|\cdot|\varphi_k\cdot\psi_k|dx \leq \int_{\Omega^1_\epsilon\cap U^1_\epsilon} + \int_{\Omega^2_\epsilon} + \int_{U^2_\epsilon}. \tag{6.29}$$

As the same argument as (6.5) and (6.6), we know that there exist constants $r>0,\ C_1>0$ and $C_2>0$ which are independent of k,φ_k and ψ_k such that

$$\int_{\Omega^2_{\epsilon,k}} |f'(x,u^1+v_k)-f'(x,v_k)-f'(x,u^1)|\cdot|\varphi_k\cdot\psi_k|dx \leq C_1(\text{mes}(\Omega^2_{\epsilon,k}))^{\frac{1}{r}}, \tag{6.30}$$

$$\int_{U^2_\epsilon} |f'(x,u^1+v_k)-f'(x,v_k)-f'(x,u^1)|\cdot|\varphi_k\cdot\psi_k|dx \leq C_2(\text{mes}(U^2_\epsilon))^{\frac{1}{r}}. \tag{6.31}$$

As the same argument as (6.18) and (6.19), we know that for every $\epsilon\in(0,1)$, the following limits holds uniformly for $k\in\mathbb{N}$, $||\varphi_k||_k\leq 1$ and $||\psi_k||_k\leq 1$,

$$\lim_{\delta\to0}\int_{\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k}\cap U^1_\epsilon} |f'(x,u^1+v_k)-g_\delta(x,u^1+v_k)|\cdot|\varphi_k\cdot\psi_k|dx = 0, \tag{6.32}$$

$$\lim_{\delta\to0}\int_{\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k}\cap U^1_\epsilon} |f'(x,v_k)-g_\delta(x,v_k)|\cdot|\varphi_k\cdot\psi_k|dx = 0, \tag{6.33}$$

$$\lim_{\delta\to0}\int_{\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k}\cap U^1_\epsilon} |f'(x,u^1)-g_\delta(x,u^1)|\cdot|\varphi_k\cdot\psi_k|dx = 0. \tag{6.34}$$

For $x \in \Omega^1_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^1_\epsilon$, as the same argument as (6.21), we deduce that there exists constant $M_{\epsilon,\delta} > 0$ which depends only on ϵ and δ such that

$$|g_\delta(x, v_k(x) + u^1(x)) - g_\delta(x, v_k(x)) - g_\delta(x, u^1(x))| \leq M_{\epsilon,\delta}|u^1(x)| + C(|u^1(x)|^{q-2} + |u^1(x)|^{p-2}). \tag{6.35}$$

We shall prove that for any $\epsilon > 0$, as $k \to \infty$, the limit

$$\int_{\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^1_\epsilon} |g_\delta(x, v_k + u^1) - g_\delta(x, v_k) - g_\delta(x, u^1)| \cdot |\varphi_k| \cdot |\psi_k| \to 0 \tag{6.36}$$

holds uniformly for $\varphi_k, \psi_k \in E_k$ which satisfy $||\varphi_k||_k \leq 1$ and $||\psi_k||_k \leq 1$.

We distinguish it by two cases:

Case 1. $0 < q - 2 \leq 1$. In this case, by (6.35), there exists $\widetilde{M}_{\epsilon,\delta} > 0$ such that

$$|g_\delta(x, v_k + u^1) - g_\delta(x, v_k) - g_\delta(x, u^1)| \leq \widetilde{M}_{\epsilon,\delta}|u^1|^{q-2},\ \forall x \in \Omega^1_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^1_\epsilon.$$

Then

$$|g_\delta(x, v_k + u^1) - g_\delta(x, v_k) - g_\delta(x, u^1)|^{\frac{q}{q-2}} \leq \widetilde{M}_{\epsilon,\delta}^{\frac{q}{q-2}}|u^1|^q,\ \forall x \in \Omega^1_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^1_\epsilon.$$

Since as $k \to \infty$,

$$|g_\delta(x, v_k + u^1) - g_\delta(x, v_k) - g_\delta(x, u^1)|^{\frac{q}{q-2}} \to 0\ a.e.,$$

by Lebesgue convergence theorem, we get that as $k \to \infty$,

$$\int_{\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^1_\epsilon} |g_\delta(x, v_k + u^1) - g_\delta(x, v_k) - g_\delta(x, u^1)|^{\frac{q}{q-2}} \to 0.$$

It follows that as $k \to \infty$, the limit

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^1_\epsilon} |g_\delta(x, v_k + u^1) - g_\delta(x, v_k) - g_\delta(x, u^1)| \cdot |\varphi_k \cdot \psi_k| dx \\ \leq\ & (\int_{\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^1_\epsilon} |g_\delta(x, v_k + u^1) - g_\delta(x, v_k) - g_\delta(x, u^1)|^{\frac{q}{q-2}})^{\frac{q-2}{q}} (\int_{Q_k} |\varphi_k|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}} (\int_{Q_k} |\psi_k|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}} \to 0 \end{aligned}$$

holds uniformly for $\varphi_k, \psi_k \in E_k$ which satisfy $||\varphi_k||_k \leq 1,\ ||\psi_k||_k \leq 1$.

Case 2. $q - 2 > 1$. In this case, by (6.35), we get that there exists $\widehat{M}_{\epsilon,\delta} > 0$ such that

$$|g_\delta(x, v_k + u^1) - g_\delta(x, v_k) - g_\delta(x, u^1)| \leq \widehat{M}_{\epsilon,\delta}|u^1|.$$

By Lebesgue convergence theorem, we deduce that, as $k \to \infty$, the limit

$$\int_{\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^1_\epsilon} |g_\delta(x, v_k + u^1) - g_\delta(x, v_k) - g_\delta(x, u^1)|^3 \to 0$$

holds uniformly for $\varphi_k, \psi_k \in E_k$ which satisfy $||\varphi_k||_k \leq 1,\ ||\psi_k||_k \leq 1$. Therefore, as $k \to \infty$, the limit

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^1_\epsilon} |g_\delta(x, v_k + u^1) - g_\delta(x, v_k) - g_\delta(x, u^1)| \cdot |\varphi_k \cdot \psi_k| dx \\ \leq\ & (\int_{\Omega^1_{\epsilon,k} \cap U^1_\epsilon} |g_\delta(x, v_k + u^1) - g_\delta(x, v_k) - g_\delta(x, u^1)|^3)^{\frac{1}{3}} (\int_{Q_k} |\varphi_k|^3)^{\frac{1}{3}} (\int_{Q_k} |\psi_k|^3)^{\frac{1}{3}} \to 0 \end{aligned}$$

holds uniformly for $\varphi_k, \psi_k \in E_k$ which satisfy $||\varphi_k||_k \leq 1,\ ||\psi_k||_k \leq 1$.

Thus (6.36) holds. By $(6.27) - (6.34)$ and (6.36), we get (6.26). Finally, by inductive argument, we can get the desired result of this Lemma. □

Proof of Lemma 3.10:

(1). By Lemma 3.8, we get that for any $\varphi \in (N_i^k)^\perp$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{Q_k} \nabla(\widehat{u}_k^i + \widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}) + \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}) \cdot \nabla\varphi \\ &\quad + \int_{Q_k} V(x) \cdot (\widehat{u}_k^i + \widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}) + \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}) \cdot \varphi \\ &\quad - \int_{Q_k} f(x, \widehat{u}_k^i + \widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}) + \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})\varphi, \end{aligned} \tag{6.37}$$

and for any $\psi \in N_i^\perp$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \nabla(u^i + \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}) + \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}) \cdot \nabla\psi \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x) \cdot (u^i + \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}) + \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}) \cdot \psi \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x, u^i + \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}) + \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j})\psi. \end{aligned} \tag{6.38}$$

Note that the limit

$$||\omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}) - \chi_k \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j})||_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} \to 0,\ k \to \infty \tag{6.39}$$

holds uniformly for $\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2 \leq \delta_0^2$ and

$$||e_{i,j} - \chi_k e_{i,j}||_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} \to 0,\ ||u^i - \widehat{u}_k^i||_k \to 0,\ k \to \infty. \tag{6.40}$$

By (6.38) − (6.40) and Lemma 3.2, we get that as $k \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} o(1) &= \int_{Q_k} \nabla(\widehat{u}^i + \chi_k \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}) + \chi_k \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}) \cdot \nabla\psi \\ &\quad + \int_{Q_k} V(x) \cdot (\widehat{u}^i + \chi_k \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}) + \chi_k \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}) \cdot \psi \\ &\quad - \int_{Q_k} f(x, \widehat{u}^i + \chi_k \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}) + \chi_k \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j})\psi \end{aligned} \tag{6.41}$$

holds uniformly for $\psi \in N_i^\perp$ satisfying $||\psi|| \leq 1$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2 \leq \delta_0^2$. It is easy to verify that the limit

$$(\chi_k \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}),\ \chi_k e_{i,j})_k \to 0,\ k \to \infty \tag{6.42}$$

holds uniformly for $\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2 \leq \delta_0^2$, since $(\omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}),\ e_{i,j}) = 0$. Recall that $P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}$ is the orthogonal projection from E_k into $(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp$, by (6.42) and (6.39), we get that the limit

$$||\omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}) - P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\chi_k \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j} e_{i,j}))||_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} \to 0,\ k \to \infty \tag{6.43}$$

holds uniformly for $\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2 \le \delta_0^2$. By (6.43) and (6.41), we get that as $k \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} o(1) \;\; = \;\; & \int_{Q_k} \nabla(\widehat{u}^i + P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\chi_k \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})) + \chi_k \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j}) \cdot \nabla\psi \\ & + \int_{Q_k} V(x) \cdot (\widehat{u}^i + P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\chi_k \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})) + \chi_k \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j}) \cdot \psi \\ & - \int_{Q_k} f(x, \widehat{u}^i + P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\chi_k \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})) + \chi_k \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})\psi. \end{aligned} \tag{6.44}$$

Choose $\varphi = \widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}) - P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\chi_k \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j}))$ and let $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be an extension of φ. We have $\varphi \in (\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp$. Then minus (6.37) by (6.44), by mean value theorem, we get that

$$\Big(P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\nabla^2 J_k(u_{i,k,t}))\varphi, \varphi\Big)_k \to 0, \ k \to \infty \tag{6.45}$$

holds uniformly for $\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2 \le \delta_0^2$, where

$$u_{i,k,t} = \widehat{u}_k^i + (1-t)\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}) + tP_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\chi_k \omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})) + \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}$$

and $t \in [0,1]$. By Lemma 3.6, we know that the operator $P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\nabla^2 J_k(u_{i,k,t})|_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp})$ is invertible and there exists constant $\eta > 0$ such that

$$||(P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\nabla^2 J_k(u_{i,k,t})|_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}))^{-1}|| \le \eta. \tag{6.46}$$

By (6.45) and (6.46), we get that

$$||\varphi||_k \to 0, \ k \to \infty \tag{6.47}$$

holds uniformly for $\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2 \le \delta_0^2$. Thus the result (1) of this Lemma follows from (6.47) and (6.43) directly.

(2). Differentiating the equalities (6.37) and (6.38) for the variable $x_{i,s}$, we get that for any $\varphi \in (N_i^k)^\perp$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \;\; = \;\; & \int_{Q_k} \nabla((\widehat{w}_k^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})\chi_k e_{i,s} + \chi_k e_{i,s}) \cdot \nabla\varphi \\ & + \int_{Q_k} V(x) \cdot ((\widehat{w}_k^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})\chi_k e_{i,s} + \chi_k e_{i,s}) \cdot \varphi \\ & - \int_{Q_k} f'(x, \widehat{u}_k^i + \widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}) + \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}) \cdot ((\widehat{w}_k^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})\chi_k e_{i,s}) \cdot \varphi \\ & - \int_{Q_k} f'(x, \widehat{u}_k^i + \widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}) + \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j}) \cdot (\chi_k e_{i,s}) \cdot \varphi \end{aligned} \tag{6.48}$$

and for any $\psi \in N_i^\perp$,

$$0 \;\; = \;\; \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \nabla((\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s} + e_{i,s}) \cdot \nabla\psi$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} V(x)\cdot((\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s}+e_{i,s})\cdot\psi\\
&-\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f'(x,u^i+\omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})+\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})\cdot((\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s})\cdot\psi\\
&-\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f'(x,u^i+\omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})+\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})\cdot e_{i,s}\cdot\psi. \qquad (6.49)
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that the limit

$$
||(\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s}-\chi_k(\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s}||_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}\to 0,\ k\to\infty \qquad (6.50)
$$

holds uniformly for $\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2 \leq \delta_0^2$. By (6.39), (6.40), (6.50), the result (1) of Lemma 3.10 and Lemma 3.2, we get that as $k\to\infty$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f'(x,u^i+\omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})+\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})\cdot((\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s})\cdot\psi\\
=\ &\int_{Q_k} f'(x,\widehat{u}_k^i+\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})+\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})\cdot(\chi_k(\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s})\cdot\psi\\
&+o(1) \qquad (6.51)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f'(x,u^i+\omega^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})+\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})\cdot e_{i,s}\cdot\psi\\
=\ &\int_{Q_k} f'(x,\widehat{u}_k^i+\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})+\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})\cdot(\chi_k e_{i,s})\cdot\psi+o(1)\\
&\qquad (6.52)
\end{aligned}
$$

By (6.39), (6.40) and $(6.48)-(6.52)$, we can get that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{Q_k}\nabla((\widehat{w}_k^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})\chi_k e_{i,s}+\chi_k e_{i,s})\cdot\nabla\varphi\\
&+\int_{Q_k} V(x)\cdot((\widehat{w}_k^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})\chi_k e_{i,s}+\chi_k e_{i,s})\cdot\varphi\\
&-\int_{Q_k} f'(x,\widehat{u}_k^i+\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})+\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})\cdot((\widehat{w}_k^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})\chi_k e_{i,s})\cdot\varphi\\
=\ &\int_{Q_k} f'(x,\widehat{u}_k^i+\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})+\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})\cdot(\chi_k e_{i,s})\cdot\varphi \qquad (6.53)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\int_{Q_k}\nabla(\chi_k(\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s}+\chi_k e_{i,s})\cdot\nabla\psi
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +\int_{Q_k} V(x)\cdot(\chi_k(\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s}+\chi_k e_{i,s})\cdot\psi \\
& -\int_{Q_k} f'(x,\widehat{u}^i+\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})+\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})\cdot(\chi_k(\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s})\cdot\psi \\
= & \int_{Q_k} f'(x,\widehat{u}^i+\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})+\chi_k\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})\cdot\chi_k e_{i,s}\cdot\psi+o(1). \qquad (6.54)
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $((\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s},\ e_{i,t})=0$, we get that

$$
((\chi_k\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s},\ \chi_k e_{i,t})=o(1),\ k\to\infty \qquad (6.55)
$$

holds uniformly for $\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2\le\delta_0^2$. By (6.55) and (6.50), we get that the limit

$$
||(\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s}-P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\chi_k(\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s})||_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}\to 0,\ k\to\infty \qquad (6.56)
$$

holds uniformly for $\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2\le\delta_0^2$. By (6.54) and (6.56), we get that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{Q_k} \nabla(P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\chi_k(\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s})+\chi_k e_{i,s})\cdot\nabla\psi \\
& +\int_{Q_k} V(x)\cdot(P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\chi_k(\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s})+\chi_k e_{i,s})\cdot\psi \\
& -\int_{Q_k} f'(x,\widehat{u}^i+\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})+\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})\cdot(P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\chi_k(\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s}))\cdot\psi \\
= & \int_{Q_k} f'(x,\widehat{u}^i+\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})+\chi_k\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})\cdot\chi_k e_{i,s}\cdot\psi+o(1). \qquad (6.57)
\end{aligned}
$$

Choose $\varphi=(\widehat{w}_k^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})\chi_k e_{i,s}-P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\chi_k(\omega^i)'(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j})e_{i,s})$ and let $\psi\in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be an extension of φ. We have $\varphi\in(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp$. Then minus (6.53) by (6.57), we get that

$$
\Big(P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\nabla^2 J_k(u_{i,k}))\varphi,\ \varphi\Big)_k\to 0,\ k\to\infty \qquad (6.58)
$$

holds uniformly for $\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2\le\delta_0^2$, where $u_{i,k}=\widehat{u}^i+\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}\chi_k e_{i,j})+\chi_k\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}e_{i,j}$. By Lemma 3.6, we know that the operator $P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\nabla^2 J_k(u_{i,k})|_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp})$ is invertible and there exists constant $M>0$ such that

$$
||(P_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}(\nabla^2 J_k(u_{i,k})|_{(\widehat{N}_i^k)^\perp}))^{-1}||\le M. \qquad (6.59)
$$

By (6.58) and (6.59), we get that

$$
||\varphi||_k\to 0,\ k\to\infty \qquad (6.60)
$$

holds uniformly for $\sum_{j=1}^{l_i} x_{i,j}^2\le\delta_0^2$. Thus the result (2) of this Lemma follows from (6.60) and (6.56) directly. □

Proof of Lemma 3.11:

(1). Let $\theta_k^i(h_i) = w_k^i(h_i) - \widetilde{T}_k(w_k^i(h_i)),\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$. By (3.20) and the fact that $|b_k^i - b_k^j| \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$ for $i \neq j$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(w_k^i(\sum_{s=1}^{l_i} x_{i,s} e_{i,s}^k),\ e_{j,t}^k\right)_k &= \left((\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{s=1}^{l_i} x_{i,s}\chi_k e_{i,j}))(\cdot + b_k^i),\ e_{j,t}^k\right)_k \\
&= \left((\widehat{w}_k^i(\sum_{s=1}^{l_i} x_{i,s}\chi_k e_{i,j})),\ (\chi_k e_{j,t})(\cdot + b_k^j - b_k^i)\right)_k \\
&= \begin{cases} 0, & i = j \\ o(1), & \text{as } k \to \infty,\ i \neq j. \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.61}$$

By (6.61), we get that the limit

$$||\theta_k^i(h_i)||_k \to 0 \ \text{ as } k \to \infty \tag{6.62}$$

holds uniformly for h_i satisfying $|||h_i||| \leq \delta_0$. Thus by the result (1) of Lemma 3.8, we know that as $k \to \infty$, the limit

$$\widetilde{T}_k(\nabla J_k(u_k^i + \widetilde{T}_k(w_k^i(h_i)) + h_i)) \to 0$$

holds uniformly for h_i satisfying $|||h_i||| \leq \delta_0$. By Lemma 3.4 and the fact that $\lim_{k\to\infty} ||u_k - \sum_{i=1}^n u_k^i||_{H^1(Q_k)} = 0$, we get that as $k \to \infty$, the limit

$$\int_{Q_k} |f(x, u_k + \sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{T}_k(w_k^i(h_i)) + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n f(x, u_k^i + \widetilde{T}_k(w_k^i(h_i)) + h_i)| \cdot |\varphi_k| \to 0$$

holds uniformly for $h = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i$ satisfying $|||h||| \leq \delta_0$ and $\varphi_k \in E_k$ satisfying $||\varphi_k||_k \leq 1$. Thus we deduce that as $k \to \infty$, the limit

$$\widetilde{T}_k(\nabla J_k(u_k + \sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{T}_k(w_k^i(h_i)) + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i)) \to 0 \tag{6.63}$$

holds uniformly for $h = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i$ satisfying $|||h||| \leq \delta_0$. Since $\widetilde{T}_k(\nabla J_k(u_k + w_k(\sum_{i=1}^n h_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i)) = 0$, by (6.63), we get that as $k \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \widetilde{T}_k(\nabla J_k(u_k + w_k(\sum_{i=1}^n h_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i)) - \widetilde{T}_k(\nabla J_k(u_k + \sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{T}_k(w_k^i(h_i)) + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i)) \\
= & \left\{\int_0^1 \widetilde{T}_k(\nabla^2 J_k(u_k + (1-t)w_k(\sum_{i=1}^n h_i) + t\sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{T}_k(w_k^i(h_i)) + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i))dt\right\} \\
& \times(\sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{T}_k(w_k^i(h_i)) - w_k(\sum_{i=1}^n h_i)) \\
= & \ o(1)
\end{aligned} \tag{6.64}$$

holds uniformly for $h \in \overline{B_{\Lambda_k}(0, \delta_0)}$. By Lemma 3.6, we know that when $k \geq k_0$,

$$||(\int_0^1 \widetilde{T}_k(\nabla J_k(u_k + (1-t)w_k(\sum_{i=1}^n h_i) + t\sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{T}_k(\omega_k^i(h_i)) + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i))dt)^{-1}|| \leq \eta$$

holds uniformly for $h = \sum_{i=1}^n \overline{B_{\Lambda_k}(0, \delta_0)}$. Thus we get that as $k \to \infty$,

$$\sup\{||w_k(\sum_{i=1}^n h_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{T}_k(w_k^i(h_i))||_k \ :\ h = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i \in \overline{B_{\Lambda_k}(0, \delta_0)}\} \to 0. \tag{6.65}$$

The result (1) of this lemma follows from (6.65) and (6.62) directly.

(2). By Lemma 3.8, we know that for any $\varphi \in \Pi_k$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (\widetilde{T}_k \nabla J_k(u_k + w_k(\sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) + \sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s),\ \varphi)_k \\ &= \int_{Q_k} \nabla(u_k + w_k(\sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) + \sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) \cdot \nabla\varphi + \int_{Q_k} V(x) \cdot (u_k + w_k(\sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) + \sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) \cdot \varphi \\ &\quad - \int_{Q_k} f(x, u_k + w_k(\sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) + \sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) \cdot \varphi. \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating the above equality for the variable $x_{i,j}$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{Q_k} \nabla(w_k'(\sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s)e_{i,j}^k + e_{i,j}^k) \cdot \nabla\varphi + \int_{Q_k} V(x) \cdot (w_k'(\sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s)e_{i,j}^k + e_{i,j}^k) \cdot \varphi \\ &\quad - \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u_k + w_k(\sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) + \sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) \cdot (w_k'(\sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s)e_{i,j}^k) \cdot \varphi \\ &\quad - \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u_k + w_k(\sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) + \sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) \cdot e_{i,j}^k \cdot \varphi. \end{aligned} \tag{6.66}$$

Since $\varphi \in \Pi_k$, we have $(e_{i,j}^k, \varphi)_k = 0$. Thus by (6.66), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{Q_k} \nabla(w_k'(\sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s)e_{i,j}^k) \cdot \nabla\varphi + \int_{Q_k} V(x) \cdot (w_k'(\sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s)e_{i,j}^k) \cdot \varphi \\ &\quad - \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u_k + w_k(\sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) + \sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) \cdot (w_k'(\sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s)e_{i,j}^k) \cdot \varphi \\ &= \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u_k + w_k(\sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) + \sum_{s=1}^{n} h_s) \cdot e_{i,j}^k \cdot \varphi. \end{aligned} \tag{6.67}$$

By the same argument and noting that $(w_k^s)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k = 0$ if $s \neq i$, we know that for any $\varphi \in \Pi_k$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{Q_k} \nabla((w_k^s)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k)) \cdot \nabla\varphi + \int_{Q_k} V(x) \cdot ((w_k^s)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k) \cdot \varphi \\ &\quad - \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u_k^s + w_k^s(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k) + \sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k) \cdot ((w_k^s)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k) \cdot \varphi \\ &= \delta_{s,i} \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u_k^s + w_k^s(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k) + \sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k) \cdot e_{i,j}^k \cdot \varphi \end{aligned} \tag{6.68}$$

By Lemma 3.4, we get that as $k \to \infty$, the following two equalities

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{Q_k} f'(x, \sum_{s=1}^{n} u_k^s + \sum_{s=1}^{n} w_k^s(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k) + \sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k) \cdot e_{i,j}^k \cdot \varphi \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^{n} \int_{Q_k} f'(x, u_k^s + w_k^s(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k) + \sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k) \cdot e_{i,j}^k \cdot \varphi + o(1) \end{aligned} \tag{6.69}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{Q_k} f'(x,\sum_{s=1}^{n}u_k^s+\sum_{s=1}^{n}w_k^s(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)+\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)\cdot((w_k^s)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k)\cdot\varphi\\=&\sum_{s=1}^{n}\int_{Q_k} f'(x,u_k^s+w_k^s(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)+\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)\cdot((w_k^s)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k)\cdot\varphi\\&+o(1)\end{aligned}\tag{6.70}$$

hold uniformly for $h\in\overline{B_{\Lambda_k}(0,\delta_0)}$ and $\varphi\in\Pi_k$ satisfying $||\varphi||\le 1$. Furthermore, if $s\ne i$, then by (3.20) and the fact that $|b_k^i-b_k^s|\to\infty$ as $k\to\infty$, we get that the following two limits

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{Q_k} f'(x,u_k^s+w_k^s(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)+\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)\cdot((w_k^i)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_i}x_{i,t}e_{i,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k)\cdot\varphi=0\tag{6.71}$$

and

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{Q_k} f'(x,u_k^s+w_k^s(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)+\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)\cdot e_{i,j}^k\cdot\varphi=0\tag{6.72}$$

holds uniformly for $\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}^2\le\delta_0^2$. By (6.69) $-$ (6.72), we get that as $k\to\infty$, the following two equalities

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{Q_k} f'(x,\sum_{s=1}^{n}u_k^s+\sum_{s=1}^{n}w_k^s(h_s)+\sum_{s=1}^{n}h_s)\cdot((w_k^i)'(h_i)e_{i,j}^k)\cdot\varphi\\=&\int_{Q_k} f'(x,u_k^i+w_k^i(h_i)+h_i)\cdot((w_k^i)'(h_i)e_{i,j}^k)\cdot\varphi+o(1)\end{aligned}\tag{6.73}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{Q_k} f'(x,\sum_{s=1}^{n}u_k^s+\sum_{s=1}^{n}w_k^s(h_s)+\sum_{s=1}^{n}h_s)\cdot e_{i,j}^k\cdot\varphi\\=&\int_{Q_k} f'(x,u_k^i+w_k^i(h_i)+h_i)\cdot e_{i,j}^k\cdot\varphi+o(1)\end{aligned}\tag{6.74}$$

hold uniformly for $\sum_{s=1}^{n}h_s\in\overline{B_{\Lambda_k}(0,\delta_0)}$ as $k\to\infty$. By (6.68), (6.73), (6.74) and the fact that $(w_k^s)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k=0$ if $s\ne i$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{Q_k}\nabla(\sum_{s=1}^{n}(w_k^s)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k)\cdot\nabla\varphi+\int_{Q_k}V(x)\cdot(\sum_{s=1}^{n}(w_k^s)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k)\cdot\varphi\\=&\int_{Q_k}\nabla((w_k^i)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_i}x_{i,t}e_{i,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k)\cdot\nabla\varphi+\int_{Q_k}V(x)\cdot((w_k^i)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_i}x_{i,t}e_{i,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k)\cdot\varphi\\=&\int_{Q_k} f'(x,u_k^i+w_k^i(\sum_{t=1}^{l_i}x_{i,t}e_{i,t}^k)+\sum_{t=1}^{l_i}x_{i,t}e_{i,t}^k)\cdot e_{i,j}^k\cdot\varphi\\&+\int_{Q_k} f'(x,u_k^i+w_k^i(\sum_{t=1}^{l_i}x_{i,t}e_{i,t}^k)+\sum_{t=1}^{l_i}x_{i,t}e_{i,t}^k)\cdot((w_k^s)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k)\cdot\varphi.\\=&\int_{Q_k} f'(x,\sum_{s=1}^{n}u_k^s+\sum_{s=1}^{n}w_k^s(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)+\sum_{t=1}^{l_s}x_{s,t}e_{i,t}^k)\cdot e_{i,j}^k\cdot\varphi\end{aligned}$$

$$+\int_{Q_k} f'(x,\sum_{s=1}^{n} u_k^s+\sum_{s=1}^{n} w_k^s(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)+\sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)\cdot(\sum_{s=1}^{n}(w_k^s)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k)\cdot\varphi$$
$$+o(1). \qquad (6.75)$$

Hence by (6.75), $\lim_{k\to\infty}||u_k-\sum_{s=1}^{n}u_k^s||_k=0$ and the result (1) of this Lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{Q_k}\nabla(\sum_{s=1}^{n}(w_k^s)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k)\cdot\nabla\varphi+\int_{Q_k}V(x)\cdot(\sum_{s=1}^{n}(w_k^s)'(\sum_{t=1}^{l_s} x_{s,t}e_{s,t}^k)e_{i,j}^k)\cdot\varphi\\
&-\int_{Q_k}f'(x,u_k+w_k(\sum_{s=1}^{n}h_s)+\sum_{s=1}^{n}h_s)\cdot(\sum_{s=1}^{n}(w_k^s)'(h_s)\cdot\varphi\\
=\ &\int_{Q_k}f'(x,u_k+w_k(\sum_{s=1}^{n}h_s)+\sum_{s=1}^{n}h_s)\cdot e_{i,j}^k\cdot\varphi+o(1). \qquad (6.76)
\end{aligned}$$

holds uniformly for $\sum_{s=1}^{n}h_s\in\overline{B_{\Lambda_k}(0,\delta_0)}$ as $k\to\infty$.

Minus (6.67) by (6.76), we get that for any $\varphi\in\Pi_k$,

$$\left((\widetilde{T}_k\nabla^2J_k(u_k+w_k(\sum_{s=1}^{n}h_s)+\sum_{s=1}^{n}h_s))(w_k'(\sum_{l=1}^{n}h_l)e_{i,j}^k-(\sum_{s=1}^{n}(w_k^s)'(h_s)e_{i,j}^k)),\ \varphi\right)_k$$
$$=o(1),\ \text{as } k\to\infty. \qquad (6.77)$$

By (3.20), we deduce that as $k\to\infty$, for any $1\le\nu\le l_t$ and $1\le t\le n$, we have

$$(\sum_{s=1}^{n}(w_k^s)'(h_s)e_{i,j}^k,\ e_{t,\nu}^k)_k\to 0 \qquad (6.78)$$

holds uniformly for $h\in\overline{B_{\Lambda_k}(0,\delta_0)}$. Thus as $k\to\infty$, the limit

$$||\sum_{s=1}^{n}(w_k^s)'(h_s)e_{i,j}^k-\widetilde{T}_k(\sum_{s=1}^{n}(w_k^s)'(h_s)e_{i,j}^k)||_k\to 0 \qquad (6.79)$$

holds uniformly for $h\in\overline{B_{\Lambda_k}(0,\delta_0)}$. By (6.79) and (6.77), we get that

$$\left((\widetilde{T}_k\nabla^2J_k(u_k+w_k(\sum_{s=1}^{n}h_s)+\sum_{s=1}^{n}h_s))(w_k'(\sum_{s=1}^{n}h_s)e_{i,j}^k-(\sum_{s=1}^{n}\widetilde{T}_k(w_k^s)'(h_s)e_{i,j}^k)),\ \varphi\right)_k$$
$$=o(1),\ \text{as } k\to\infty. \qquad (6.80)$$

Choose $\varphi=(w_k'(\sum_{s=1}^{n}h_s)e_{i,j}^k-(\sum_{s=1}^{n}\widetilde{T}_k(w_k^s)'(h_s)e_{i,j}^k))$ in (6.80) and by Lemma 3.6, we deduce that as $k\to\infty$,

$$||(w_k'(\sum_{l=1}^{n}h_l)e_{i,j}^k)-\widetilde{T}_k(\sum_{s=1}^{n}(w_k^s)'(h_s)e_{i,j}^k)||_k\to 0 \qquad (6.81)$$

holds uniformly for $h\in\overline{B_{\Lambda_k}(0,\delta_0)}$.

Thus the result **(2)** of this Lemma follows from (6.81) and (6.79) directly. □

References

[1] N. Ackermann, A nonlinear superposition principle and multibump solutions of periodic Schrödinger equations, J. Funct. Anal., **234** (2006), 277-320.

[2] N. Ackermann, T. Weth, Multibump solutions of nonlinear periodic Schrodinger equations in a degenerate setting, Comm. Contemp. Math., **7** (2005), 269-298.

[3] S. Alama, Y. Y. Li, On “multibump” bounded states for certain semilinear elliptic equations, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **41** (1992), 983-1026.

[4] V. Benci, A new approach to the Morse-Conley theory and some applications, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl., **158** (1991), no. 4, 231–305.

[5] K. C. Chang, Infinite Dimentional Morse Theory and Multiple Solution Problem, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1991.

[6] K. C. Chang, N. Ghoussoub, The Conley index and the critical groups via an extension of Gromoll-Meyer theory, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal., **7** (1996), no. 1, 77–93.

[7] V. Coti Zelati, P. H. Rabiniwitz, Homoclinic orbits for second order Hamiltonian systems possessing superquadratic potentials, J. Amer. Math. Soc., **4** (1991), 693-727.

[8] V. Coti Zelati, P. H. Rabiniwitz, Homoclinic type solutions for a semilinear elliptic PDE on $\mathbb{R}^N$, Comm. Math. Pure. Appl., **XLV** (1992), 1217-1269.

[9] D. Gromoll, W. Meyer, On differential functions with isolated critical points, Topology, **8** (1969), 361-369.

[10] W. Kryszewski, A. Szulkin, Generalized linking theorem with an application to a semilinear Schrödinger equation, Adv. Differential Equations **3** (1998), no. 3, 441–472.

[11] Z. L. Liu, Z. Q. Wang, Multi-bump type nodal solutions having a prescribed number of nodal domains, I, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, **22** (2005), no. 5, 597-608.

[12] Z. L. Liu, Z. Q. Wang, Multi-bump type nodal solutions having a prescribed number of nodal domains, II, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, **22** (2005), no. 5, 609-631.

[13] A. A. Pankov, Periodic nonlinear Schrödinger equation with application to photonic crystals, Milan. J. Math. **73** (2005), 259-287.

[14] A. A. Pankov, K. Pflüger, On a semilinear Schrödinger equation with periodic potential, Nonliear Analysis T. M. A., **33** (1998), 593-609.

[15] P. H. Rabinowitz, Minimax Methods in Critical Point Theory with Applications to Diffrential Equations, AMS Reg. Conf. Ser. Math. **65** (1986).

[16] M. Reed, B. Simon, Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, Vol. IV, Academic Press, New York, 1978.

[17] E. Séré, Existence of infinitely many homoclinic orbits in Hamiltonian systems, Math. Z., **209** (1992), no. 1, 27–42.

[18] C. Troestler, M. Willem, Nontrivial solution of a semilinear Schrödinger equation, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **21** (1996), no. 9-10, 1431–1449.

[19] M. Willem, Minimax Theorems, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 24. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1996.